





BX 5151 .P656 1855 v.3

Pinnock, W. H.

The laws and usages of the church  
and the clergy



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015





W. M. Benoit.  
St. Louis.  
1860.



Clerical Papers,  
ON THE  
MINISTERIAL DUTIES,  
AND THE  
Management of a Parish.

&c. &c. &c.

---

**C.**

---



# THE LAWS AND USAGES

OF THE

## Church and the Clergy.

---

THE ORNAMENTS AND GOODS OF THE CHURCH.

[Nos. X—XVI.]

---

BY THE REV. W. H. PINNOCK, LL.D. CANTAB.

*Author of the Analyses of 'Scripture History,' 'The Reformation,'  
'Ecclesiastical History,' &c.*

---

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY AND FOR J. HALL & SON;  
SOLD ALSO BY WHITTAKER & CO. AVE MARIA LANE;  
BELL & DALDY, 186, FLEET-STREET, LONDON;  
AND J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

---

M.DCCC.LV.





## INDEX

### TO THE LAWS AND USAGES

Affecting

THE ORNAMENTS, AND GOODS, OF THE CHURCH.

[Nos. X to XVI. *inclusive* ; pp. 474 to 794.]

	Page
ACHIEVEMENT, heraldric . . . . .	689
<i>Acts of Uniformity</i> in force . . . . .	477
<i>Affinity</i> , computation of . . . . .	749
<i>Aire</i> , or Napkin . . . . .	597
<i>Alabaster</i> , ornaments in . . . . .	697
<i>Albe</i> . . . . .	488
<i>Alienation of Church Goods</i> . . . . .	483
<i>All-hallows</i> , an . . . . .	643
<i>Almery</i> . . . . .	596
<i>Almonier</i> . . . . .	492
ALMS BASIN . . . . .	(601) 491, 770
cost of . . . . .	493
— CHEST . . . . .	493, 771
cost of . . . . .	494
form of . . . . .	494, 771
uses of . . . . .	788
— DISH . . . . .	492, 770
place of . . . . .	601
— PLATE . . . . .	492
cost of . . . . .	493
ALTAR . . . . .	489
preparation of . . . . .	773
of stone . . . . .	489, 533, 534, 772
the name . . . . .	528
— Bread . . . . .	774
— Candlesticks . . . . .	669
— CHAIRS . . . . .	741, 794
By Rubrics . . . . .	741
position of . . . . .	744

ALTAR CLOTHS		576, 777
colours of		581, 778
ornamental		578
Romish		780
— CROSS		785
— Curtains		774, 781
— Desk		593
— LIGHTS <i>on the</i>		655
— Piece		637, 643
— RAILS		602, 783
— Screen		642, 762, 774
— Steps		774
— Stones		774
— SUPER		540, 772
— Tomb		696
<i>Ama</i> , the		782
AMBO, the		647, 725
<i>Ambry</i> , the		596
<i>Ampullæ</i>		599
<i>Amula</i>		782
<i>Analogium</i>		651
<i>Anax</i> or Flagon		599
<i>Angel</i> , a symbol		781
ANTEPENDIA		580, 622, 774, 777
<i>Antiphons</i> , where chanted		791
<i>Appeal</i> , as to Monuments		681
<i>Armorial Bearings</i> in Churches		646
<i>Arms</i> , Coat of, in Churches		684
ARTICLES, XXXIX, quoted—the xxiind.		638
the xxxvth.		512, 638
<i>Aumbrye</i>		596, 782
BAG for Alms		491, 770
BANNS OF MARRIAGE, Register of		519
how published		519
provision of		520
<i>Baptismal Cruets</i>		634
BAPTISMS, Register of		521
provision of		521, 522
Custody of		522
<i>Baptisterium</i>		628, 630
<i>Baptistery</i>		630
<i>Barrell-Organ</i>		711
BASIN for Alms		491, 601
— not instead of Fonts		626, 790
<i>Bay-leaves</i> in Churches		620
BELFRY, under the Incumbent		500, 502
BELLS, discussed		494
chiming of		506
control over		499
custody of		499
not essential		487, 766
old, selling		484, 485
one only required		(495,) 498



(BELLS) peal of . . . . .	501
property in . . . . .	486
provision of . . . . .	498
repair of . . . . .	498
ringing of . . . . .	496
forbidden, when . . . . .	497
permitted, when . . . . .	505
<i>Sexton's</i> duty as to . . . . .	496
toll'd, when . . . . .	495, 497
use of, not restricted . . . . .	451
BELL-RINGERS . . . . .	501
control of . . . . .	502
fees of . . . . .	505
remove, to . . . . .	506
Rules for . . . . .	504
Salaries of . . . . .	487, 498
substitution for . . . . .	507
— RINGING, the consent necessary . . . . .	500
Rules for . . . . .	504
— ROPES, property in . . . . .	499
provision of . . . . .	498
<i>Bema</i> . . . . .	605
described . . . . .	650
<i>Benches in Chancel</i> . . . . .	740
BENEFACTIONS, <i>Table of</i> . . . . .	747
BIBLE, found by the Parish . . . . .	(486,) 510, 771
cost of . . . . .	510
for the Clerk . . . . .	515
Ornaments of the . . . . .	771
Ribbons for the . . . . .	515
BIER, the . . . . .	508, 771
<i>Bishop's Chapel</i> , goods in the . . . . .	486
<i>Black</i> , when used . . . . .	581
Romish use . . . . .	780
<i>Black Wine-Bottle</i> . . . . .	599
<i>Blue</i> , when used . . . . .	581
<i>Book of Advertisements</i> , The . . . . .	477
BOOK OF OFFICES . . . . .	514
at Communion Table . . . . .	593
cost of . . . . .	514
BOOKS for <i>Divine Service</i> . . . . .	489, 510
if torn . . . . .	515
repair of . . . . .	515
<i>Bouquets of Flowers</i> in Churches . . . . .	625
<i>Bowl of the Chalice</i> . . . . .	599
BOX for <i>Alms</i> . . . . .	491
<i>Box</i> , branches of the shrub in Churches . . . . .	622
BRASSES . . . . .	592
monumental . . . . .	697
to copy . . . . .	697
BREAD for <i>Communion</i> , breaking . . . . .	561
cutting . . . . .	561
instruments for . . . . .	561
how conveyed . . . . .	599
kind of . . . . .	555, 774

(BREAD <i>for Communion</i> ), leavened	555
preparation of	560
supply of	552
BREAD AND WINE, found by Churchwardens	(482, 550), 552
how conveyed to church	599
placing of	570, 775
procession of	776
quality of	551
what remains of	564, 574
<i>Brushes</i> in Church, not essential	487
<i>Bureta</i> , or <i>Burette</i>	599
BURIALS, Bells at	497
Register of	521
custody of	522
provision of	522
<i>Burial District, Metropolitan</i>	691
CALF, a symbol	781
CALL BELL	496
Sexton to ring	506
<i>Camellia Flowers</i> in Churches	622
<i>Canaliculi</i>	598
CANDLES <i>on the Altar</i>	656
lighted (see <i>Lights</i> )	664
unlighted	659
Romish use	773
CANDLESTICKS <i>on the Altar</i>	489, 792
discussed	655
dimensions of	669
for Evening Service	659
————— <i>Elevation</i>	793
————— <i>Standing</i>	793
————— in the Church	766
<i>Canister</i> for Communion Bread	597
CANONS of 1603, quoted, 15th	495, 671
20th	550, 594, 595
45th	517
46th	513, 517
47th	517
48th	518
49th	512, 517
50th	517
51st	517
52nd	515, 517, 519
53rd	517
54th	517
70th	520, 523, 722
80th	510
81st	626, 633
82nd	481, 527, 542, 577, 732, 738, 760
83rd	724
84th	493
85th	479, 587
87th	763

(CANONS of 1603, quoted), 88th	497, 502
99th	748
111th	497
<i>Cantors</i> , Seats for the	794
<i>Carpets</i>	592, 781
CEMETERIES, <i>Gravestones</i> , &c. in	682
Bishop's power as to	682
damage to	682
erection of	682
Inscription on	682
prohibition	682
removal of	682
right in	682
<i>Cere-cloth</i> , the	780
CHAIRS at the Communion Table	740, 794
CHALICE, the	(489, 595) 596, 782
cover of, for a Paten	601
Veil	590
CHANCEL, <i>Monuments</i> , &c. in	690
Lay Rector's right	690
Vicar's right	690
CHANTING, <i>control over the</i>	721
<i>Chest</i> for Alms	493
<i>Chimes</i> not essential	(487, 766) 526
repair of	526
<i>Chiming Bells</i>	506
CHOIR, <i>control over the</i>	720
instrumental	722
CHURCH GOODS	see Goods
CHURCH <i>decorated with Flowers</i>	617
Keys of the	499
CHURCHWARDENS, Books of the	523
custody of	524
disposing of Church Goods	485
duty as to Monuments	681
their position	768
to find Ornaments	479, 768
punished for default	479, 482
to take care of	482
withholding	485
to repair Church Goods	487
<i>Circle</i> , an emblem	644
<i>Clepsydra</i>	728
CLERGY <i>have nothing to do with Ornaments</i>	480, 482
CLERK'S Books	515
Desk	734
<i>Cloaks of Mourning</i>	767
<i>Clocks</i> not essential	(487, 766) 526
repair of	526
<i>Cloths for Communion Service</i>	576
<i>Coat of Armour</i> in Churches	684
defacing	684
removing	692
<i>Cocoa-nut Matting</i>	592
<i>Coffer</i> for Alms	493

<i>Coffins</i> , carrying objectionable	509
COLOURS of Altar Cloths	581, 584, 585, 777
Romish use	778
change of	780
— of Vestments	581, 584
COMMUNION-BREAD and WINE	549
Churchwardens' duty in	552
Ministers' ditto	551
Parishioners' ditto	552
kind and quality of	551, 774
supply of	552
CLOTHS	576, 777
fair linen	579, 583, 586, 777
coverings for	586
custody of	586
repair of	577, 586
DESK	593
PLATE	594
box for	596
cost of	599
custody of	595
display of	782
enumerated	594
legends on	600
old, selling	485
Pocket Service of	596
provision of	595
RAILS	602
character of	602, 783
repaired by the Parish	487
when first ordered	544
TABLE	(488), 527
its appellation	528
material	(533, 771) 534
place	541
size	772
decked with Flowers	623
ordered	527
Computation of Degrees of Affinity	750
Consanguinity	750
Jewish	750
Concha	605
Consanguinity, computation of	749
collateral	749
lineal	749
if illegitimate	757
Cope, the	488
Coped Grave-stone, fee for	688
permission for	688
Corbal-Bracket	606
Corbels	774
Cornu-Epistolæ	653
Evangelii	653
Corona	793
Coronation Chair	743

CORPORAL, the	586, 588, 589, 780
Romish	781
Oath	781
CORPORAS, the	(489, 777,) 589
<i>Corporis Palla</i>	583
COVERINGS of the Altar	489
of the Altar-Cloth	586
Communion-Table	576, 586
Pulpit	731
<i>Coverlets</i>	781
CREDENCE-NICHE	608
TABLE	489, 571, 775, 783
discussed	604
illegal	607
removal of	769
<i>Credential</i> , the	606
<i>Credentz-teller</i>	606
CREED, the, on Church Walls	738
CROSS, kinds of	609
an emblem	643, 644
at Funerals	611
for marking	787
memorial	698
on the Altar	480, 611, 622
illegal	615
on Altar-slab	780
on Communion-Table	785
ornamented	616
Romish use of	773, 786
sign of the	612
<i>Crown</i> , an emblem	644
<i>Crozier</i> , the	488
<i>Crucifix</i> , the	610, 611, 614, 643
<i>Cruelts</i> , or <i>Crewetts</i>	599, 782
CUP, <i>Communion</i>	594, 596
character of	597
provision of	595
<i>Cup-Board</i> for Communion Plate	596
CURATE, term explained	550
<i>Curfew-Bell</i>	499
<i>Cushions</i> not essential	487
for the Altar	592
Pulpit	731
<i>Cussinus</i>	593
<i>Custody of Church Goods</i>	483
<i>Custom as to fees for Monuments, &amp;c.</i>	683
DEAD, carrying the, objectionable	509
DECORATIONS Ecclesiastical	489
of Churches	622
provision for	788
<i>Degrees of Affinity</i>	749, 753
computation of	749
<i>Consanguinity</i>	749, 753
computation of	749

<i>Desks</i> for Communion-Service	593
Kneeling	593
<i>Diapers</i>	585
<i>Discus</i>	589
<i>Dish</i> for Alms	492
DIVINE SERVICE, things necessary for	486
when Tombs, &c. obstruct	685
<i>Dorsal</i>	781
<i>Dossel</i>	622, 762
described	781
<i>Dove</i> , an emblem	644
EAGLE, brass	633
a symbol	781
for Lectern	651, 791
<i>Effigies</i> on Tombs	637, 638
ELEMENTS, carrying the	776
placing the	571
remains of the	574
<i>Emblems</i> on Altar Cloths	585
Gravestones, &c.	698
Windows	644
<i>Encaustic Tiles</i>	592
<i>Epigonaton</i>	591
<i>Epistle and Gospel</i> , where read	649
EPITAPHS	690
Books of	702
character of	701
to be sanctioned	690
<i>Erasmus's Paraphrase</i>	771
<i>Evangelistic Symbols</i> , the	781
EVERGREENS in Churches	617, 622, 787
FACULTY for Goods and Ornaments	769
Organs	707
Gravestones, &c.	678, 685
cost of	686
<i>Fald-Stool</i>	670, 740, 794
for Litany	673, 674, 734
<i>Faldn</i>	674
<i>Falditorium</i> , or <i>Faldistory</i>	743, 794
FEES for Monuments, Gravestones, &c.	686
custom as to	683
recovery of	687
Table of	688
to make Scale of	688
<i>First Cousins</i> Marrying	751
<i>Fish</i> , an emblem	644
FLAGON	595
described	599, 782
<i>Flags</i> on Churches	500, 505, 618
FLAT GRAVESTONES	680
fee for	688
permission for	688

FLOWERS <i>on the Altar</i>	481, 623, 778, 787
symbolical	624
<i>in Churches</i>	617, 787
Churchwardens' consent	769
when put up	623
when taken down	618
Romish usage	789
<i>on Graves</i>	624
at Marriages	625
Flutes <i>in Churches</i>	711, 722
Folding Chair	743
FONT	488
discussed	625, 791
the Cover	628, 633, 634
the Drain	632, 634
its material	627
its place	627, 635
the requisites of	790
substitutes not allowed	629, 633, 790
— <i>Miniature</i>	627, 632
FOOT-STONES <i>to graves</i>	678
date on	688
fee for	688
letters on	688
permission for	688
Frescoes <i>on Church Walls</i>	642, 644
FRONTALS, Altar	580, 585, 774, 777
kinds of	781
Fronts	489
FUNERAL BELL	496
Sexton to ring	506
— <i>Pall</i>	766, 767
Furniture, Church	480
found by Churchwardens	482
GALLERIES set up by the Parish	487
Garlands <i>in Churches</i>	500, 618
Gift of Church Ornaments	480
Glazing	645
God, emblem of	644
God's Board	528
Goods, Church	478
alienation of	483
custody of	483
if damaged	485
Faculty necessary for	769
gift of	486
introducing	768
loan of	486
Ordinary's power in	483
property in	484
removing	768
repair of	486
if stolen	485
what necessary	487

Goods, in Bishop's Chapel	486
<i>Gowns</i> , black	584
violet	584
Graves, Flowers on	624
<i>Green</i> , colour, when used	581
Romish use	779
GRAVESTONES, &c. discussed (see MONUMENTS)	676
in <i>Cemeteries</i> (see CEMETERIES)	682
emblems on	698
Fees for	686
recovery of	687
flat	680
property in	691
<i>Railings</i> round	688
removing	692
repair of	693
rules for putting down	687
style of	698
<i>Gypsum</i> for Monuments	697
HAGIOSCOPE	489
<i>Hand</i> , an emblem	644
<i>Hangings</i> in Church	637, 762
<i>Harmonium</i> in Churches	711
<i>Hatchments</i>	689
removing	692
<i>Head Memorial of oak</i> , fee for	688
HEAD-STONES to Graves	678
Crosses for	698
Fees for	688
permission for	688
<i>Hearse</i>	509
<i>Cloth</i>	766
<i>Heraldric devices</i>	646, 647, 689, 703
<i>High-Altar</i>	548, 664, 772
<i>Holly</i> in Churches	619, 621, 789
HOLY GHOST, emblem of	644
<i>Holy Loaf</i>	563
<i>Rood</i>	610
<i>Table</i>	528, 531
HOMILIES, <i>Book of</i> , found by Parish	511
authority of	513
quoted	638
read in Churches	512
<i>Horologium</i>	728
<i>Hour-glass</i>	728
superseded	526
IMAGES in Churches	636
to remove	610, 638
on Tombs, excepted	638, 683, 689
<i>Immersion</i>	633



INCUMBENT <i>as to Gravestones, &amp;c.</i>	678
his remedy	689
<i>India Matting</i>	592
<i>Injunctions of Edw. VI, authority of</i>	656
INSCRIPTIONS ON MONUMENTS, &c.	690, 701
Fee for	688
to be sanctioned.	690
<i>Instrumental Music in Churches</i>	711, 715
<i>Instruments for cutting the Bread</i>	561
<i>Ivy in Churches</i>	619, 621
JESSE, a	643
JESUS CHRIST, emblem of	644
KEYS of the Church, custody of	499
<i>Kindred, degrees of</i>	756
KING'S ARMS, not essential	734, 766
<i>Kneeling Desk</i>	594
<i>— Rails</i>	603
<i>Knells at Funerals</i>	496
<i>Knives for cutting Bread</i>	561
<i>Knop, the</i>	599
LAMB, an emblem	644
<i>Lamps in Churches</i>	766
<i>Laurel in Churches</i>	620
<i>Laurustinus in Churches</i>	789
<i>Laws of the Church of England, old in force</i>	478
<i>Lay Rector's right as to Monuments</i>	690
LECTERN, or Lecturn	(489, 725, 734,) 647, 791
<i>Lectorium</i>	647
<i>Lectricium</i>	653
LESSONS, the, where read	648
<i>Lettern, the</i>	647
<i>Letters of Orders, not a Licence</i>	516
LEVITICAL DEGREES	747
history of	751
Table of	753
<i>Licence to Preach</i>	516
LIGHTS on the Altar	488, 792
discussed	655
in Colleges	665
<i>Injunctions of Edw. VI.</i>	655
authority of	658
— of Hen. VIII.	657
illegal	658, 670
historical evidences	660
in Private Chapels	666
at reading the Gospel	662
Two	656
LINEN CLOTHS	488, 579, 583
embroidered	778

<i>Lion</i> , a symbol . . . . .	781
LITANY, where to be said . . . . .	671
LITANY-Desk . . . . .	670
——— <i>Stool</i> . . . . .	734, 794
discussed . . . . .	670
its place . . . . .	672
to be covered . . . . .	676
<i>Loan of Church Goods</i> to be entered . . . . .	486
<i>Locker</i> , a . . . . .	782
λογχη for Sacred Bread . . . . .	561
LORD'S PRAYER on Church walls . . . . .	738
<i>Lord's Table</i> , the . . . . .	528
LUKE, St. symbol of . . . . .	781
 MANIPLE, The . . . . .	591
<i>Mappa</i> , the . . . . .	782
<i>Mappa Mundi</i> . . . . .	643
MARK, St., symbol of . . . . .	781
<i>Marking Crosses</i> . . . . .	787
MARRIAGE Contract between 1st Cousins . . . . .	751
disabilities of . . . . .	747
void, when . . . . .	748
by Levitical Law . . . . .	757
by Statute Law . . . . .	749
——— <i>Registers of</i> . . . . .	520
conveyance to Church . . . . .	523
copies of annually . . . . .	521
custody of by Canon . . . . .	520
by Statute law . . . . .	522
in duplicate . . . . .	522
provision of . . . . .	522
——— within the Levitical Degrees . . . . .	759
with Wife's Sister . . . . .	755, 758
<i>Mats</i> in Church not essential . . . . .	487, 766
MATTHEW, St., symbol of . . . . .	781
<i>Memorials</i> . . . . .	699
MEMORIAL TABLETS. (See TABLETS) . . . . .	677
<i>Oak Beam</i> , fee for . . . . .	688
<i>Head slab</i> , fee for . . . . .	688
<i>Mensa Propositionis</i> . . . . .	606
<i>Mensula</i> . . . . .	607
<i>Metropolitan Burial District</i> . . . . .	691
<i>Ministeriales</i> . . . . .	598
<i>Minstrel's Gallery</i> . . . . .	716
<i>Mistletoe</i> in Churches . . . . .	621
MONUMENTAL BRASSES . . . . .	696
emblems . . . . .	698
<i>Tablets</i> . . . . .	704
MONUMENTS, GRAVESTONES, &c. discussed . . . . .	676
alterations in . . . . .	680
appeals concerning . . . . .	681
in <i>Cemeteries</i> (see CEMETERIES) . . . . .	682
in Chancel . . . . .	690
Churchwardens' power in . . . . .	681

<b>MONUMENTS, GRAVESTONES, &amp;c., (continued)</b>	
Custom as to . . . . .	683
damaging by cattle . . . . .	685
defacing . . . . .	683
Faculty necessary . . . . .	678, 686
Fees for . . . . .	686
Incumbents,' remedy . . . . .	689
Images on . . . . .	689
Incumbents,' power . . . . .	686
when sufficient . . . . .	688
Injuring . . . . .	683
Lay Rector's right in Chancel . . . . .	690
Legality of . . . . .	677
in Metropolitan Burial District . . . . .	691
objectionable, when . . . . .	689
if an obstruction . . . . .	685
Ordinary's consent . . . . .	681
permission for . . . . .	678
property in . . . . .	684, 691
Railings round . . . . .	689
removing . . . . .	692
repairing . . . . .	693
Vicar's right in Chancel . . . . .	690
<i>Mounds in Church-yards</i> . . . . .	691
<i>Mourning Cloaks</i> . . . . .	767
cloth of . . . . .	767
<i>Mundatory</i> . . . . .	591
<i>Mural Tablets</i> . . . . .	700
<i>MUSIC in Churches</i> . . . . .	711, 714
<i>Musical Instruments in Church</i> . . . . .	711, 715
<b>NAPKIN, the</b> . . . . .	577, 586, 777
its character . . . . .	587
for the Chalice . . . . .	590
<b>NECESSARY Goods to be found</b> . . . . .	487
<i>Needlework on Church Linen &amp;c.</i> . . . .	777, 781
<i>Note</i> . . . . .	598
<b>OAK TRAYS for Sacrament Bread</b> . . . . .	561
<b>OBITUARY WINDOWS</b> . . . . .	702
<i>Oblationarium</i> . . . . .	605
<i>Octagon, symbolical</i> . . . . .	790
<i>Offertorium</i> . . . . .	491, 492, 782
<b>OFFERTORY, collecting the</b> . . . . .	770
Basin . . . . .	601
Dish . . . . .	491
Veil . . . . .	782
<i>Offices, Book of</i> . . . . .	514
cost of . . . . .	514
<b>ORDINARY's power over Church Goods</b> . . . . .	483, 487
Monuments, &c. . . . .	678
appeal against . . . . .	681

ORGAN not essential . . . . .	(487, 766), 706
authority for . . . . .	705
consent of Parish to . . . . .	709
control over . . . . .	720
erection of . . . . .	707
expenses of . . . . .	708
Faculty necessary . . . . .	707
gift of . . . . .	480, 709
origin of the . . . . .	712
position of . . . . .	716
property in . . . . .	486, 710
removal of . . . . .	710
silent when . . . . .	717
—— <i>Barrell</i> . . . . .	711
—— small <i>Keyed</i> . . . . .	711
ORGANIST, appointment of . . . . .	718
election of . . . . .	720
control over . . . . .	720
<i>Salary of</i> . . . . .	487, 719
ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	474
By Canon . . . . .	479
"Rubric . . . . .	475
"Statute Law . . . . .	476
enumerated . . . . .	490
in 2nd of Edw. VI. . . . .	488
in 5th of Edw. VI. . . . .	488
gift of . . . . .	486
introducing . . . . .	768
loan of . . . . .	486
provided by Parishioners . . . . .	479
punishment for default . . . . .	479, 482
removing . . . . .	769
repair of . . . . .	486
<i>Opus Plumarium</i> . . . . .	781
<i>Ostiarivus</i> . . . . .	496
PAINTINGS in Churches . . . . .	636, 639, 791
<i>Pall</i> , Funeral . . . . .	766
<i>Palla Altaris</i> . . . . .	580, 583
—— <i>Corporis</i> . . . . .	583, 588
<i>Palm-bearing</i> in Churches . . . . .	620
<i>Paratorium</i> . . . . .	605, 607
<i>Παραπαιζον</i> . . . . .	605
PARISH to find Ornaments . . . . .	479
power of majority . . . . .	487
when consent immaterial . . . . .	480
—— BOOKS, custody of . . . . .	522, 524
injuring . . . . .	524
withholding . . . . .	524
—— CHEST, custody of . . . . .	(722) 522
Key of . . . . .	522
provision of . . . . .	722
—— Clerk's Books . . . . .	515
—— Desk . . . . .	734

(Parish) Registers	521
custody of	522, 722
transmission of	523
<i>Parker's Table of Degrees</i>	756
PASSING-BELL	495, 497
<i>Patella</i>	600
PATEN	489, 589, 597
described	600, 783
<i>Patna</i>	600
<i>Peal of Bells</i>	502
<i>Pede Cloaths</i>	592, 781
<i>Pelican</i> , an emblem	644
<i>Pelvicula Hamularum</i>	600
<i>Pennons</i> in Churches	684
PEW-OPENERS, salaries of	487
<i>Phœnix</i> , an emblem	644
<i>Pictures</i> in Churches	636
removing	638
<i>Piscina</i> , the	489
<i>Plaster of Paris</i> , Monuments of	697
PLATE for Alms	492
for Communion Bread	600
<i>Pomum</i> , the	598
POOR-BOX, the	491, 493
<i>Poor-Man's Box</i>	491, 494
<i>Pot</i> , or <i>Stoup</i>	594
PRAYER-BOOK found by Parish	486, 511
cost of	511
for the Clerk	515
in Colleges and Halls	511
<i>Preach</i> , licence to	516
<i>Preachers</i> , strange, registered	515
<i>Prize-Ringing</i>	505
<i>Prohibited Degrees</i>	748
<i>Property in Church Goods</i>	484
<i>Prothesis</i>	605
<i>Pugillares</i>	598
PULPIT, the	489, 649
Canonically required	724
its introduction	725
place of	725, 728
provision of	727
repair of	727
right to	726
<i>Cloths</i> not essential	487, 766
<i>Coverings</i>	731
<i>Cushion</i>	731
<i>Pulpitum</i>	647
<i>Pulvinar</i>	593
<i>Purificatorium</i>	591
<i>Purple</i> , when used	581
<i>Pyrgus</i>	653

RAILS, <i>Communion</i>	602, 783
READING DESK	648, 651
discussed	731
law of the	732
place of	733
PEW	727, 732
Red, when used	581
Romish use	779
Regalls	711, 716
REGISTER of Banns	519
Baptisms	521
Burials	521
Marriages	522
custody of the	522
of <i>Strange Preachers</i>	515
Repair of Church Goods	486, 487
REREDOS,	489, 637, 642, 774
defined	762
of Commandments	762
Ribbons, or Markers	515
Rigols	716
RINGERS, control over	502
rules for	503
Salaries of	487, 766
substitute for	507
RINGING BELLS	496
Canons on	497
consent necessary	500
rules for	504
when forbidden	497
Rochets	488
Rood	610, 786
of Grace	610
Loft	610, 649, 725, 787
Screen	489, 642
Rosemary in Churches	619, 621
Roses in Churches	790
Rostrum	654
ROYAL ARMS not essential	487
discussed	734
Introduction of	735
modern usage	737
Rubricating	762
Rush-bearing Sunday	619
Rushes in Churches	619, 621
SACRAMENTAL Bread Cutter	561
Plate,	(See Communion Plate)
Sacrarium	605
Saints, pictures, &c. of	640
Sanctuary	605
SCRIPTURE-TEXTS on Church Walls	489, 737
ancient usage	739
Scyphus, the	783

<i>Secretarium</i> , the . . . . .	605, 607
<b>SEDILIA</b> . . . . .	489, 794
described . . . . .	744
discussed . . . . .	740
<i>Sella Plicatilis</i> . . . . .	743
<i>Sentences</i> on Church Walls . . . . .	737
<i>Sepulchral emblems</i> . . . . .	698
<i>Sepulchres</i> . . . . .	678
<i>Seraphine</i> in Churches . . . . .	711
<i>Sermon to be preached</i> . . . . .	513
from steps of the Altar . . . . .	725
<b>SERVICE BOOKS</b> , the . . . . .	514
one at Communion-Table . . . . .	593
Ornaments of . . . . .	771
<i>Sexton</i> to ring the Bells . . . . .	496
<i>Side Board</i> . . . . .	607
— Table . . . . .	571, 604, 607
<i>Sindon</i> . . . . .	580
<b>SINGERS</b> , hired . . . . .	717
control over . . . . .	720
<b>SINGING</b> in Churches . . . . .	714
control over . . . . .	721
<i>Sounding Board</i> . . . . .	730
<i>Spear</i> , the, for Sacramental Bread . . . . .	561
<i>Stained Glass Windows</i> . . . . .	636, 643, 645, 647, 791
<b>STALLS</b> in Chancel . . . . .	740, 745
<i>Statues</i> in Churches . . . . .	641
<b>STATUTES</b> quoted . . . . .	
13 <i>Edw.</i> I. Stat. 4. (Clergy) . . . . .	479
25 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 19. (Auc. Const.) . . . . .	488
( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 22. (Levit. Deg.) . . . . .	749, 751, 754, 758
27 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 25. (Vagabonds) . . . . .	493
28 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 7. (Levit. Deg.) . . . . .	752, 754, 758
( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 16. (Ditto) . . . . .	752, 754, 758
31 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 8. (Proclam.) . . . . .	656, 657
32 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 38. (Pre-Con.) . . . . .	752, 753, 754, 758, 759
34 & 35 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 23. (Proclam.) . . . . .	656
35 <i>Hen.</i> VIII. c. 1. (Levit. Degr.) . . . . .	752, 754
1 <i>Edw.</i> VI. c. 12. (Proclam.) . . . . .	656, 657
2 & 3 <i>Edw.</i> VI. c. 1. (Uniform.) . . . . .	476, 477, 656, 657, 753
( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 23. (Pre-Con.) . . . . .	753
3 & 4 <i>Edw.</i> VI. c. 10. (Images) . . . . .	636, 638, 639, 683
1 <i>Mary</i> Sess. II. c. 1. (Success) . . . . .	752, 754
1 <i>Phil.</i> & <i>Ma.</i> c. 8. (Success) . . . . .	752, 753, 754
1 <i>Eliz.</i> c. 1. (Suprem.) . . . . .	752, 753, 754
1 <i>Eliz.</i> c. 2. (Uniform.) . . . . .	475, 477, 481, 511
13 & 14 <i>Car.</i> II. c. 4. (Uniform.) . . . . .	478, 511
30 <i>Car.</i> II. c. 3. (Burying) . . . . .	521
32 <i>Car.</i> II. c. 1. (Ditto) . . . . .	521
6 & 7 <i>Wil.</i> III. c. 6. (Regist.) . . . . .	521
9 & 10 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 35. (Ditto) . . . . .	521
5 <i>Anne.</i> c. 5. (Union) . . . . .	478
5 & 6 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 5. (Union) . . . . .	478
17 <i>Geo.</i> II. c. 38. (Chw.) . . . . .	523
26 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 33. (Mar.) . . . . .	521

STATUTES quoted *continued*)

52 Geo. III. c. 146. (Reg.)	521, 522, 723
54 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 108. (Burying)	521
58 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 69. (Vestry)	524, 525
59 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 134. (Ch. Bld.)	693
4 Geo. IV. c. 76. (Marr.)	519
11 Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 66. (Forg.)	521
1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 60. (Vestry)	525
5 & 6 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 54. (Marr.)	749, 758
6 & 7 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 85. (Marr.)	521
( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 86. (Reg.)	521, 522, 523
7 Will. IV. & 1 Vict. c. 22. (Reg.)	521
3 & 4 Vict. c. 72. (Marr.)	521
( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 92. (Reg.)	521
10 & 11 Vict. c. 65. (Cemet.)	682, 691
13 & 14 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 52. (Burials)	691
15 & 16 ( <i>ib.</i> ) c. 85. (Ditto)	691
<i>Steps to the Altar</i>	774
<i>Stone Altar</i>	489, 534, 605, 772
<i>Stoop or Stoup</i>	594
<i>Stoves in Church not essential</i>	487, 766
<i>Strange Preachers, Register of</i>	515
<i>Sudarium</i>	591
<i>Suggestum, or Suggestus</i>	653, 729
<i>Sun-Dial superseded</i>	526
<i>Super Altar</i>	540, 585, 772
<i>Super Frontal</i>	585
<i>SURPLICE to be found by the Parish</i>	482, 488, 486
<i>Symbols, Evangelistic</i>	781

TABLE, the COMMUNION, its appellation	528, 531
——— of Benefactions	747
——— of Levitical Degrees	747
Lc'd Coke's	753
Abp. Parker's	756
——— of Proposition	604
——— of Prothesis	605, 784
——— of Ten Commandments	760
TABLETS, <i>Memorial</i>	677
character of	704
emblems on	698
Faculty for. (See MONUMENTS.)	678, 693
Fees for	687
Mural	700
plan of	693
<i>Tapestries</i>	637, 642, 762
<i>Tapets</i>	781
TEN-COMMANDMENTS, place of	647, 760
<i>Tent Wine</i>	563
TERRIER	763
authority of	763
form of	764
<i>Tesselated Pavement</i>	592



<i>Texts on Church Walls</i> . . . . .	738
<b>TOMBS, emblems on</b> . . . . .	698
images on . . . . .	638
legality of . . . . .	677
protected . . . . .	683
<i>Tomb Stones.</i> . . . .	(See MONUMENTS)
<i>Tonne, or Flagon</i> . . . . .	597
<i>Trays, oaken, for Sacramental Bread</i> . . . . .	561
<i>Triangle, an emblem</i> . . . . .	644
<i>Tribunal Ecclesiæ</i> . . . . .	647
<i>Tricanale</i> . . . . .	597
<i>Trine Compass, an emblem</i> . . . . .	644
<i>Trinity, emblem of the</i> . . . . .	644
<i>Triptych</i> . . . . .	637, 774
described . . . . .	646
for Benefactions . . . . .	747
<b>UNIFORMITY, Acts of, in force</b> . . . . .	477
<i>Urns on Tombs</i> . . . . .	700
<b>VASES of flowers</b> . . . . .	481, 623, 624
<i>Veil for the Chalice</i> . . . . .	588, 590, 778
<i>Velamen</i> . . . . .	580
<i>Velum Calicis</i> . . . . .	590
<i>Vestments</i> . . . . .	488
<b>VESTRY FURNITURE not essential</b> . . . . .	487, 766
<i>Books</i> . . . . .	524
custody of . . . . .	524
CLERK . . . . .	525
MEETING, power over Church Goods . . . . .	487
<b>VICAR's Right as to Monuments, &amp;c.</b> . . . .	690, 693
<i>Violet, when used</i> . . . . .	581
Romish use . . . . .	779
<i>Violincellos in Churches</i> . . . . .	711
<i>Violins in Churches</i> . . . . .	722
<b>WAFER-BREAD</b> . . . . .	555, 557, 559, 562, 775
<b>WATER with the wine</b> . . . . .	565
modern opinions on . . . . .	567
<i>Buckets for the Font</i> . . . . .	634
<i>Wax Cloth</i> . . . . .	780
<i>White, when used</i> . . . . .	581
Romish use . . . . .	778
<i>Wife's Sister, Marriage with</i> . . . . .	755, 758
<b>WINDOWS, Obituary</b> . . . . .	702
of stained glass . . . . .	636, 645
stopped by a Tomb . . . . .	685
removing . . . . .	692

WINE, <i>Communion</i>	563
colour of	564
quality of	563
Water with	565
what remains of	564, 574
Wood Carvings	643
——— <i>Memorials to Graves</i>	688
Wreaths of Flowers in Churches	618
 YELLOW, when used	581
Yew, in Churches	621
in Churchyard	622, 787

---

#### ADDENDA.

CROSSES [p. 609-616; 785-787].—*Counsel's Opinion* was taken upon the question of the legality of retaining the *Crosses* on the Altars of St. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, and St. BARNABAS', *Pimlico*, by Sir J. E. Harington, Churchwarden, April 17th, 1851; when it was stated by MR. E. BADELEY, that 'the Bishop has primarily the 'right of determining whether such an Ornament shall be allowed': but when Ornaments have been consecrated with a Church, and thus tacitly sanctioned by the Bishop, the Bishop has no power to authorize their removal; nor can they be removed except by formal process of the Ecclesiastical court.—(See the '*Full Case and Opinion*,' published by J. Hayes, Pimlico, from the "ECCLESIOLOGIST.").

LIGHTS ON THE ALTAR [p. 655-670; 792-793].—The same learned *Council* is of opinion that the use of "*Lights upon the Altar*" at the time of the celebration of the Holy Communion, is allowed and enjoined by the law of the Church of England. MR. BADELEY bases his decision upon the *Constitution* of ABP. REYNOLDS (which we have referred to at p. 655 note),—"Tempore quo Missarum "*Solemnia peraguntur, accendantur duæ candelæ, vel ad minus una*". (WILKIN'S *Conc.* ii. 513; GIBS: *Cod.* i. 471): adding, that this *Constitution* is law by force of 25 Hen. viii. c. 19. s. 7. (See p. 265, or 802), which has not been altered or repealed.—(See MR. BADELEY's argument, February 12th. 1851. pub. by J. Hayes. *ibid.*)

# The Ornaments of the Church,

AND

## OF THE MINISTERS THEREOF.

THE importance that has recently been attached to this question by the revival of '*Ornaments*,' and of certain practices connected with them, perfectly unknown to the present and previous generation, and not recognized by any RUBRIC or CANON now in force, has led to much discussion with respect to the propriety of their introduction, as well as with regard to the authority that may give or withhold a sanction to their use. Ritualists, and Ecclesiastical Antiquarians, have in vain applied themselves to clear up to general satisfaction the doubts and difficulties with which this subject is beset; and neither argument, nor historical research, has yet been able to appease the diversity, or set the controversy at rest. Individual Clergymen, therefore, have continued to assume to themselves the right of introducing such *Ornaments*, and practices, as they may conceive to be implied, although not actually prescribed by the LITURGY; and so long as there is no existing RUBRIC or CANON, prohibitory of their use, they hold their proceedings to be beyond the reach of Episcopal interdict, or Ecclesiastical censure; regarding the jurisdiction of the Bishop in the matter merely as an appellat power, only to be exercised when '*doubt or diversity*' shall arise. The BISHOP OF LONDON animadverting on this practice, thus remarks:—

'It has been a subject of great uneasiness to me to see the changes, which have been gradually introduced by a few of the Clergy, at variance, as I think, with the spirit of the Church's directions; and, in some instances, with the letter. It has been always esteemed an evidence of the wisdom and moderation of those who framed our COMMON PRAYER, that they retained "such Ceremonies as they thought best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition, putting

“away other things which they perceived to be most abused, as in  
 “men’s ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries.”  
 ‘But this principle has been lost sight of by the persons to whom I  
 allude; and they have presumed, *following their own private  
 judgment*, and not the rules nor intention of the Church, to  
 ‘introduce, one by one, those very forms and observances, which  
 ‘the Reformers of our Liturgy had purposely discontinued and laid  
 ‘aside, but which it is now sought to revive, some of them for  
 ‘the first time since the Reformation. These innovations have, in  
 ‘some instances, been carried to such a length as to render the  
 ‘Church Service almost *histrionic*. I really cannot characterize  
 ‘by any gentler term the continual *changes of posture*, the frequent  
 ‘*genuflexions*, the *crossings*, the *peculiarities of Dress*, and some of  
 ‘the *decorations* of Churches, to which I allude. They are after  
 ‘all, a poor imitation of the Roman ceremonial, and furnish, I have  
 ‘no doubt, to the observant members of that Church, a subject,  
 ‘on the one hand, of ridicule, as being a faint and meagre copy of  
 ‘their own gaudy Ritual, and, on the other hand, of exultation, as  
 ‘preparing those who take delight in them to seek a further  
 ‘gratification of their taste in the Roman Communion. I am by no  
 ‘means insensible to the value of the *æsthetic* principle in the  
 ‘externals of religion; but great caution is requisite, not to lay  
 ‘such stress upon that which is material and emblematical, as to  
 ‘detract from the importance of that which is purely spiritual; to  
 ‘substitute, in fact, the mere machinery of religion for the effects  
 ‘which it is intended to produce. I have always contended, and  
 ‘still contend, that we are bound to carry out all the Church’s  
 ‘directions for the celebration of Divine Service; but I contend,  
 ‘also, that we offend against her order, not less by the admission of  
 ‘*what it forbids, or does not enjoin*, than by the *omission of anything  
 ‘which it prescribes*.’.....(The Bishop, after referring to what he had  
 said in previous ‘CHARGES,’ proceeds:—)..... ‘I have been told  
 ‘that I had no authority to forbid anything which was not in  
 ‘express terms forbidden by law; and that practices, which, though  
 ‘purposely laid aside by the Church, and so by implication con-  
 ‘demned, have not been actually prohibited, are therefore lawful;  
 ‘and that canonical obedience to a Bishop is only that which  
 ‘he can enforce in a Court of law: and so the innovations, which I  
 ‘objected to, have been persisted in, with additional changes  
 ‘introduced from time to time, with the manifest purpose of  
 ‘assimilating the Services of our Reformed Church as nearly as  
 ‘possible to those of the Roman. Once more I declare my entire  
 ‘disapproval of such practices, and my earnest wish that, while  
 ‘every direction of the Rubric and Canons is observed where it is  
 ‘possible, *no form should be introduced* into the celebration of Public  
 ‘Worship *which is not expressly prescribed* by them, or *sanctioned  
 ‘by long-established usage*.’ (p. 50—54.)—Charge. 1850.

After these observations of the BISHOP of LONDON, it need hardly be said that this state of things can scarcely be approved, nor indeed defended, and calls therefore for the most candid inquiry—an inquiry devoid of personal predilections, and free from party bias. It is in this spirit that we now proceed to the discussion of the questions before

us. We will begin by introducing to the Reader the authorities in our possession on the general question of '*Ornaments*,' as well of the Church, as of the Minister; and the first and most important is the following RUBRIC of the present Book of Common Prayer, since upon one expression in it, viz. '*by the authority of Parliament*'—hangs apparently all the difficulty, inasmuch as our modern and stricter Rubricians have been charged with proceeding in this matter, as if these words had no place in the *Rubric* at all; or were mere expletives of no force or power. The RUBRIC thus reads—

¶ '*And here is to be noted that such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.*'—(1662.).

In the two preceding Liturgies, the *Rubrics* on this point are of a similar character, as we may perceive from the annexed Rubric, taken from the Liturgy of *James I.* (1604), and from the Liturgy of *Elizabeth* (1559); in both of which the reading is alike, word for word—

'*And here is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his Ministration, shall use such Ornaments in the Church as were in use by Authority of Parliament in the Second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this Book.*' (1559. 1604.)—KEELING, 2, 3.

With this last *Rubric* we have now nothing to do; except that it supplies an explanation of what is meant by '*the Authority of Parliament*,' from reference being made therein to the Act of Uniformity\* (1 *Eliz. c. 2.*) placed at the head of each of those Liturgies; from which Act (1 *Eliz. c. 2.*),

\* The Rubric in the SCOTCH LITURGY (1637) deviates but little from the above; thus—

'*And here is to be noted that the Presbyter or Minister at the time of the Communion, and at other times in his Ministration, shall use such Ornaments in the Church, as are prescribed,*

as we shall presently see, the wording of the *Rubric* in our existing Liturgy is evidently derived.

The *Rubrical direction*, then, first quoted, is the one by which we are now bound, and it refers us in like words to '*the Authority of Parliament in the Second year of the reign of King Edward VI.*,' which '*Authority of Parliament*' thus enacts:—

'All and singular Ministers in any Cathedral or Parish Church, or other place within....the King's dominions, shall from and after the Feast of Pentecost next coming (*Whitsunday*, June 9th. 1549) be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Evensong, and celebration of the Lord's Supper commonly called the Mass, and Administration of each of the Sacraments, and all their common and open Prayer in such order and form as is mentioned in the same Book, and none other or otherwise....And....that if any manner of Parson, Vicar, or other whatsoever Minister....refuse to use the said Common Prayers, or to minister the Sacraments in such Cathedral, or Parish Church, or other places as he should use or minister the same, in such order and form as they be mentioned and set forth in the said Book, or shall use, wilfully and obstinately in the same, any other Rite, Ceremony, Order, Form, or Manner of Mass, openly or privily, or Mattens, Evensong, Administration of the Sacraments, or other open Prayers (commonly called the Service of the Church) than is mentioned and set forth in the said Book;....and shall be thereof lawfully convicted:....by verdict of twelve men, or by his own confession, or by the notorious evidence of the fact, shall lose and forfeit for his first offence one year's income of one of his Benefices or promotions, and suffer *six months' imprisonment*; for the second offence, *twelve months' imprisonment*, and be deprived of all his spiritual promotions; and for the third offence, *imprisonment for life*.'—2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1. s. 1.* (A. D. 1548-9).

By this Act we are clearly thrown upon the *First LITURGY of Edward VI.* (of 1549) for our guidance as to the '*Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof*':—

BENNET confirms this view, when he thus observes (in his *Paraphrase on the Book of Com. Pr.* A. D. 1708).—'Tis notorious that by those *Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof*, at all times of their Ministration, which were in this Church by the '*Authority of Parliament*, in the second year of King Edward VI., we are to understand such as were prescribed by the first '*Common Prayer Book of that Prince*.'—(p. 2.)

---

'or shall be by his Majesty or his Successors, according to the '*Act of Parliament provided in that behalf*.'—KEELING, 2.

THE AMERICAN LITURGY omits the *Rubric* on '*ORNAMENTS*' altogether.

Now in this *first Liturgy* (of 1549) we find two RUBRICS, one at the end of the 'COMMUNION SERVICE,' defining what *Habits* are to be worn generally; and another at the beginning of the 'COMMUNION OFFICE' prescribing the *Vestments* to be used by the Minister during the performance of that Service. But the '*Ornaments of the Church*' are left untouched; and therefore, it is contended, that we are to adopt all those that *were in use* in the Church of England in the *Second year* of the reign of King Edward VI., which 'the Authority of Parliament' has left us to gather where we can.

\* \* We ought to observe here, that the above enactment of 2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1. s. 1.* was confirmed by 1 *Eliz. c. 2. ss. 4, 5, 6.*; while in this latter Act there was also an especial clause on the *Ornaments of the Church and of the Minister*, which, as we have just said, is the undoubted original of our present *Rubric*; and runs thus—

'Be it enacted that such *Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof*, shall be retained and be in use, as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the *second year* of the reign of King EDWARD VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm\*.'—1 *Eliz. c. 2. s. 25.*

Both of these Acts (2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1*; and 1 *Eliz. c. 2.*) have been confirmed by the last *Act of Uniformity* (13 & 14 *Car. II. c. 4.*), by which we are now bound, in the following words—

'The several good *Laws and Statutes* of this Realm, which have been formerly made, and are now in force, for the UNIFORMITY of Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, within this Realm...., shall stand in full force and strength, to all intents and purposes whatsoever for the establishing and confirming of the said Book, intituled 'The Book of Common Prayer,' &c., hereinbefore mentioned to be joined and annexed

---

\* Whether the '*further order*,' here spoken of, was ever taken, is a very disputed point, as has been already shown in page 280., when discussing the authority of the "*Book of Advertisements*;" and we may add to what is there stated, the following charge from 'The Proceedings of the Committee appointed by the House of Lords in 1641, touching innovations in the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England'—'By pretending for their Innovations, the *Injunctions and Advertisements* of Queen ELIZABETH, which are not in force; but by way of commentary and imposition.'—CARDWELL'S *Conf.* 273.

‘to this Act; and shall be applied, practised, and put in use for  
 ‘the punishing of all offences contrary to the said Laws, with  
 ‘relation to the Book aforesaid, and no other.’—13 & 14 Car. II.  
 c. 4. s. 24. (See BURN’S *Eccl. Law*, Phil. III. 411.)

In addition to this, the Act, 5 Anne c. 5, which was incorporated into the *Act of Union* (5 & 6 Anne, c. 5.), provides that *all the laws* for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England, and the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government thereof, shall remain and be in full force for ever. (CRIPP’S *Laws of Ch. and Cl.* 419.)

But the *Ornaments of the Church* in the Rubrics and Enactments above quoted, and referred to, do not appear to have been thought of sufficient moment to demand any express mention or description; or perhaps their consideration may have been lost sight of in the more important question of the *Ornaments of the Minister*: we are consequently left to other authorities, such as the CANONS &c., to ascertain with any approach to precision what *Ornaments of the Church* are prescribed and permitted; as well as to distinguish those which have received the sanction of long established custom, from those which, derived from Royal Injunctions, and Episcopal Visitation Articles, depend solely on the modern spirit of innovation for their revived existence amongst us at the present day.

The subject of ORNAMENTS, therefore, naturally divides itself into two distinct branches, and will demand two separate considerations. Following the order of the RUBRIC, we shall have to treat first of the *Ornaments of the Church*, and then to discuss the *Ornaments of the Minister*. To give as full and lucid an exposition as possible of the *Laws* and *Usages* connected with this subject it will be requisite to introduce into the consideration the ‘GOODS’ or ‘INSTRUMENTS’ (*Instrumenta Ecclesiastica*) of the Church; as the distinction between *Goods* and *Ornaments* is neither clearly defined, nor, indeed, is it attempted to be maintained. At the same time it will not be out of place to speak of the *Officials* that



may be connected with any of the *Ornaments* that will come under our notice ; as with the Bells, the *Ringers* ; with the Organ, the *Organist*, &c. We will now proceed to details.

## THE ORNAMENTS AND GOODS

### OF THE CHURCH.

It is very essential that the OFFICIATING MINISTER should be aware of the exact position in which he stands with respect to the *Ornaments* and *Goods* of the Church ; and know likewise what *Ornaments* must necessarily and absolutely be supplied, and at whose cost, as well as what may be only optionally provided.

The CANONS of 1603-4, which possess the chief authority in this matter, impose the duty of providing all the necessary ORNAMENTS of the Church upon the *Churchwardens*, and upon them alone, and at the *Charge of the Parish*.

In CANON 85, it is laid down, that—‘The CHURCHWARDENS or QUESTMEN shall take care and *provide* that the Churches be well and sufficiently repaired....and *all things* there in such an orderly and decent sort, without dust or any thing that may be either noisome or unseemly, *as best becometh the House of God*, and is prescribed in an Homily to that effect...At their *Charges* unto whom by law the same appertaineth.’—CANON 85.

In default, the CHURCHWARDENS are amenable to the Ecclesiastical Court, as directed by the Statute, 13 Edw. I. St. 4. (*Circumspecte agatis*)—‘The King to his Judges sendeth greeting : use yourselves circumspectly, in all matters concerning the Prelates where they do punish for that the Church is not conveniently *decked*, in which cases, the Spiritual Judge shall have power to take knowledge, notwithstanding the King’s prohibition.’—(BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 367. e); ‘By this Statute all interference by temporal Courts in these respects is withheld.’—(ROGER’S *Ecc. Law*. p. 153.)

LORD COKE says—‘The law alloweth the Ecclesiastical Court to have conusance...for the providing of decent *Ornaments* for the celebration of Divine Service.’—(2 *Inst.* 489.)

LORD STOWELL observes—'The Law respecting Church *Ornaments* is now (1794) generally understood and settled. The *consent of the Parishioners* is not indispensably necessary, unless to charge the Parish with an expence for the support of the *Ornament* after it has been put up. But if there is no such charge incurred, the approbation of the majority of the Parishioners is not necessary, nor the disapprobation binding on the Ordinary. A Faculty does not enjoin the raising of any rate; and if it is found 'a hurthen it may be removed by another Faculty.' (*Chw. of St John, Margate (or Ramsgate) v. The Parishioners*, 1 Hagg. Cons. 198. 298.). Here LORD STOWELL decreed a Faculty for accepting and erecting an *Organ* offered to the Church, without a clause against future expences being charged to the Parish, which was rich and populous; thus carrying out a rule, which he laid down in another case, where he says 'The Court is not bound by the wish of the Majority, though it will pay great attention to it in granting a Faculty. The Court may refuse the whole Parish joined together; or may grant, if it appears necessary, a prayer on the application of one against all the rest.' (*Groves and Wright v. Rector of Hornsey*, 1 Hagg. Cons. 189. See also *Jay v. Webber*, 3 Hagg. 4; *Pearce, &c. v. Rector of Clapham*, 3 Hagg. 11.)

\*.\* If an *Ornament* had been presented to a Parish Church, or purchased by a Subscription, and the consent of the Ordinary given for its erection, it seems that the *consent or refusal of the Parishioners* to its erection would be immaterial, because neither the expence of erecting it or repairing it would in such a case fall upon them.—(*Buttsworth & Barker v. Walker & Waterhouse*, 3 Burr. 1689). See also WADDILOVE'S *Digest of Cases*. p. 104.

The CLERGYMAN, however, has nothing whatever to do with ordering the *Ornaments* or *Goods* of the Church: should he do so, he must do it at his own cost, and at his own peril. Nor has he the power of rejecting what are ordered by the CANONS, or of interfering with their custody or control. The Minister's function herein has lately been decided in the Ecclesiastical Court, as follows—

The BISHOP OF EXETER (*Dr. Phillpotts*), in his judgment in the recent case of *W. G. Parks Smith* (Clerk) 28th May, 1847—charged under 3, 4 Vict. c. 86. with 'placing or causing to be placed, and suffering to remain during the performance of Divine Service on Easter-day of this year, in various parts of the said Chapel, (St John's Tormoham), and especially on the Communion-Table, certain *Ornaments*, or other unauthorized things, being against the laws Ecclesiastical... These *Ornaments* were two glass Vases containing *Flowers*, and a *Cross* about 2 ft. high decked with *Flowers*.'—thus proceeds... 'Was it unlawful for him to do so? In answering this question, it is first necessary to remark, that *Mr. Smith* had in his own right, nothing whatever to do with the ordering of the *Ornaments* or *Furniture* of the Church. This is a matter which belongs to the Churchwardens,

' where there are such Officers ; and where there are none...to  
 ' those to whom it may have been, by proper authority confided :  
 ' to the Minister's opinion, indeed, and to his wishes, in all  
 ' lawful things, great deference ought to be, and doubtless will  
 ' always be, shown. But if he assume a right which does not  
 ' belong to him ; if he permit himself to step beyond the line of his  
 ' own duty, and to intrude on the province of others, it becomes  
 ' him to be cautious, to the utmost, against venturing on any act  
 ' which, in itself, is even questionable. Now would it be lawful  
 ' for any persons whomsoever, even for those Officers to whose  
 ' care the Ornaments of the Church are especially committed ;  
 ' would it be lawful for them to deck the Lord's Table, in prepa-  
 ' ration for the Holy Communion, with *Vases containing Flowers*,  
 ' and with a *Cross* placed on the Table for the occasion ? Certainly  
 ' not ; unless there be an express or implied direction so to do. It is  
 ' not enough, that there be no express prohibition. The very  
 ' nature of the case, the general requisition of Uniformity, and the  
 ' positive enactment, " that no Form or Order of Common Prayer,  
 ' Administration of Sacraments, Rites, or Ceremonies shall be  
 ' openly used other than what is prescribed and appointed to be  
 ' used," all alike lead to the same conclusion, that it is not  
 ' lawful for any person whomsoever, to introduce novel Ornaments,  
 ' at his own discretion. In truth, where would the claims of such  
 ' discretion end ? If one person may, at his pleasure, decorate the  
 ' Lord's Table with a *Cross*, another may equally claim to set a  
 ' *Crucifix* upon it, whilst a third might think it necessary to erect  
 ' some symbol of Puritan doctrine or feeling to mark his repro-  
 ' bation of his Romanizing neighbour. There is indeed one impor-  
 ' tant order in the Book of Common Prayer, as it is settled by the  
 ' last Act of Uniformity, and as it was enacted also by the similar  
 ' Statute of 1 *Eliz. c. 2* ; " that such Ornaments of the Church, and  
 ' of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministrations, shall  
 ' be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England,  
 ' by the Authority of Parliament in the 2nd year of the reign of  
 ' King Edward VI." Now were *Vases containing Flowers*, and  
 ' the *Cross decorated with Flowers* on the Lord's Table at the Minis-  
 ' tration of the Sacrament, in use at that period ? If it could be  
 ' shown that they were, this would indeed be a legal and full  
 ' justification of the replacing of them now, however strange and  
 ' novel such a decoration might appear. But nothing of the kind  
 ' has been affirmed....The only direction in the *Rubric* is, " that  
 ' the Table at the Communion time have a fair white linen cloth  
 ' upon it ;" and the 82nd *Canon* appoints, " that the Communion  
 ' Table shall be covered in time of Divine Service with a carpet of  
 ' silk, or other decent stuff, and with a fair linen cloth at the time  
 ' of Ministration." This must be holden virtually to exclude all  
 ' else, except what is used, or may be used, in the Service itself.  
 ' If any one venture to go further—to add anything which he may  
 ' deem an *Ornament*—he does it at his peril ; he must be prepared  
 ' to show, that what he adds " was in use, in this Church of  
 ' England, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." ;  
 ' else he renders himself liable to Ecclesiastical censures.' After  
 ' referring to primitive usage, the Bishop concludes,—' As there is  
 ' no ground on which the act, admitted by *Mr. Smith*, can be  
 ' deemed lawful, it is my duty to adjudge that he be admonished,  
 ' and I do now admonish him, not again to offend in the like

'manner; and I further order that he *pay the costs of these proceedings.*'—(quoted in STEPHEN'S *Laws Rel. to Cl.* p. 1083.).

We may add also the opinions annexed—

The *late* REV. H. J. ROSE makes the following editorial remark in the *British Magazine*—'The Clergyman does not provide the *Ornaments of the Church.* It may, or may not, be his duty to 'present the Churchwardens for not doing it; but he cannot refuse to officiate because they have not provided the proper *Ornaments.*'—(quoted in ROBERTSON'S *How shall we Conform to the Lit.* p. 77).

MR. ROGERS, (*Barrister-at-Law*) observes,—'CHURCHWARDENS 'are appointed to provide the *Furniture of the Church, the Bread and Wine for the Holy Sacrament, the Surplice, and the Books necessary for the performance of Divine Worship, and such as are directed by Law: but it is the Minister who has the use.*'—*Eccles. Law*, p. 152,

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), speaking of the *Ornaments on the Communion-Table* in reference to the case brought before the Bp. of Exeter, above quoted, says—'A Clergyman has not, in 'his own right, anything whatever to do with providing the 'Ecclesiastical *Ornaments or Furniture of the Holy-Table: it is a duty which exclusively belongs to the Churchwardens, or other Officers ejusdem generis; and if they do not provide the proper Ornaments or Furniture, they are liable to punishment in the Ecclesiastical Courts. But Churchwardens have not, nor has any other Ecclesiastical or temporal authority, except it be the Legislature, a right to place anything upon the Holy-Table, unless it was "in this Church of England by the Authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of Edward VI."* Every thing, however, that it was lawful to place on the Holy-Table in 'that year, is its legal Furniture, and indeed ought to be placed 'on it, at the present day.' (p. 1109.)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

From what has been already advanced, it is clear that the CHURCHWARDENS, or the Church Officers *ejusdem generis*, are the persons who are alone responsible for the due provision and care of the *Ornaments and Goods of the Church.* Yet if the Incumbent chooses to *present* to his Church, any 'necessary Goods,' Ornaments, or Instruments of superior kind, or more correct Ecclesiastical design, than what are already provided, the *Churchwardens* are at liberty to accept or refuse them; and it is not often they adopt the discourteous alternative of objecting to receive them.

We may now touch upon the several questions of I. *Alienation*, II. *Custody*, III. *Property*, and IV. *Repair*, as connected with this subject.

I. *Alienation of the Goods of the Church.*—

By the *Laws of England*, the *Goods* belonging to a Church may be aliened: yet the CHURCHWARDENS alone cannot dispose of them without the consent of the Parish: and a gift of such Goods by them without the consent of the Sidemen, or Vestry, is void.—WATSON'S *Cl. L.* 399. (BURN'S *Ec. L. Phil.* i. 377; STEER'S *Par. L.* Clive 38; STEPHENS' *L. Rel. to Cl.* 286.).

But by the *Civil Law*, the Goods belonging to a Church are forbidden to be alienated or pawned, unless for the redemption of Captives, for relief of the Poor in time of great famine and want, or for paying the debts of the Church, if a supply cannot be otherwise raised; or for other cases of necessity, or great advantage to the Church. And in every alienation, the cause must be first examined, and the decree of the Prelate intervene, with the consent of the whole Clergy or Chapter.—WOOD'S *Civ. L.* 142. (BURN'S *Ec. L. Phil.* i. 377; STEPHENS' *L. Rel. to Cl.* 285.).

II. *Custody of the Goods, &c.* is in the CHURCHWARDENS, as may be gathered from CANON 89, which directs—

‘All Churchwardens....last of all, going out of their Office, shall truly deliver up to the Parishioners whatsoever money or other things of right belonging to the Church or Parish, which remaineth in their hands, that it may be delivered over by them to the next Churchwardens, by bill indented.’—CANON 89.

CHURCHWARDENS may be cited by the *Ordinary* to give further account of the Church Goods, although their Accounts have been already allowed in Vestry: and if it appear that they have disposed of any of the Goods without his consent, though with the approbation of the Parishioners, and only in order to defray part of the Church-Rates or expences, the Ordinary may compel the Churchwardens to replace the Goods out of their own pockets, or inflict such other punishment as he may deem expedient.—(*Bishop v. Turner.* Godb. 279); PRIDEAUX *Chw. G. D. D.* 153, 155.

DR. PRIDEAUX speaks of the power of the *Ordinary*; thus—‘At the time when the Churchwardens pass their Accounts to the Parish, of all money received and expended during their Office, they must also give an account of the Church Goods’ committed to their charge and custody, which must be then brought forth, called over, and examined before the Parishioners in Vestry; and after that, they are to be delivered over to their successors by bill indented....and when they have faithfully accounted for all these particulars, they are then fully acquitted of their office (p. 142)....The Church Goods are, in an especial manner, under the care of the *Ordinary*; and although all the Parish have allowed the Churchwardens’ Account, yet as to these, if the *Ordinary* be dissatisfied, he may *ex-officio* call them to account before him too; and also may punish them, if he finds they have disposed of any of them, on any account whatsoever,

'although they have had the consent of every inhabitant of the Parish for it, unless they have his consent too. For otherwise, the Parishioners may combine, for the saving of their purses to the Church-Rates, to sell all the *Church Goods* and Utensils to bear the Parish charges, and so leave the Church without that which is necessary for the performing of the Divine Offices, which the *Ordinary* is bound to prevent. For he has, as to these, a right of trust as well as of jurisdiction; and, therefore, none of them are to be disposed of, or otherwise converted to any use whatsoever, without his consent first had thereto.' (p. 144, 145.).—Also in C. G. PRIDEAUX'S *Chw. Guide*. p. 303, 305; STEPHENS' *L. Rel. to Cl.* p. 285.

III. *Property in the Goods, &c.*—The Goods, Chattels, and Utensils, belonging to the Church are the property, not of the Incumbent, but of the Parishioners, yet are vested in the CHURCHWARDENS as a corporation for their use and benefit; so that if they be taken away, broken, or damaged, the *Churchwardens* shall have their action of trespass. In the capacity of a corporation the *Churchwardens* may purchase, and take *Goods* for the use of the Parish<sup>b</sup>; but they cannot dispose of any of the Church Goods without the consent of the Parishioners, in as much as they are their property; nor without the licence of the *Ordinary*, because they appertain to holy things<sup>c</sup>: nor can one of them dispose of Goods without the consent of his co-adjutor;<sup>d</sup> and the release of one Churchwarden is in no case a bar to the action of the other. Should they improperly dispose of the Goods, the Parishioners themselves can have no action against the receivers to recover them, nor against the Churchwardens for disposing of them; because, although the Goods are the property of the Parishioners, yet not they, but the *Churchwardens*, are the corporation in whom they are vested. When such a case happens, the Parishioners must wait till the new Churchwardens are chosen and admitted, who will possess the right to call their predecessors to account before the Ordinary, and bring an action against them for the detriment that has accrued to the Parish by their violation of the trust reposed in them: nor must the Parishioners complain herein, for it is at their own risk to choose and trust whom they think fit.<sup>e</sup> Again, if the *Churchwardens* would sell an old *Bell* towards other repairs, or

<sup>a</sup> *Dent v. Prudence*. 2 Str. 852; *Jackson v. Adams*. 2 Bing. N. C. 402; *Turner v. Baynes*. 2 Hen. Bl. 559; *Gibs*. 243.

<sup>b</sup> *Viner's Abr. Chm. D.* 530; 1 Vent. 89; *Dr. Prideaux* 132.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Rol. Abr. *Chw.* 393; *Starkey v. Barton*. Yelv. 173; 2 Brownl. 215.

<sup>d</sup> *Starkey v. Barton*. Cro. Jac. 234; *Northwaite v. Bennett*. 2 C. M. 316; 4 Tyr. 236. S. C.

<sup>e</sup> *DR. PRID.* 136; 2 Rol. Rep. 73; 1 Salk. 106. *Viner's Abr. Chw. A.*

dispose of old *Communion Plate* to buy new, or of any other Goods in like manner, and for similar purposes, although it may be for the use of the Parish, yet they cannot legally do so without the licence of the Ordinary, and the consent of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled.<sup>f</sup>

Whatever *Goods* of the Church be taken away, or broken, the CHURCHWARDENS have their action of trespass at the common law; although a later judgment says, the more proper remedy is in the Spiritual Court, because at the common law only damages would be recovered, while the Spiritual Court would decree the restoring of the thing itself.<sup>g</sup> Yet in a more recent case, prohibition was granted to stay a suit in the Spiritual Court for taking away two *Bells* out of the steeple; for the CHURCHWARDEN is a corporation, and the property is in him, and he may bring trover at common law.<sup>i</sup> (BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* 1. 376. STEPHENS' *L. Rel. to Cl.* 286.)

Should the *Goods of the Church* be detained, or not delivered up by the *outgoing* Churchwardens, their successors can maintain an action against them; and Churchwardens *de facto*, though their election may be disputed, have a right of action against any former Churchwarden, though not their immediate predecessor<sup>k</sup>: should the Churchwardens neglect to bring an action for loss or damage to the Church *Goods*, their successors may bring trespass for them in respect of their office, but the damage must be laid as against the Parishioners, and not themselves, although the old Churchwardens in whose time the injury occurred might have laid the damage as against themselves, or the Parishioners.<sup>l</sup> Yet the Churchwardens with the consent of the Parishioners may take a fractured *Bell*, and send it to be re-cast for a stipulated sum; and should the Founder retain it as a '*lien*' till he is paid for it, the Churchwardens will be excused in a writ of account brought against them by their successors: and so with any *stones* belonging to the Church, the Churchwardens may empower a Builder to repair with part of them any injured masonry, and to take the residue to himself in satisfaction for his labour and expences.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>f</sup> DR. PRID. 135; C. G. PRID. 266; AYLIFFE'S *Par.* 171; STEPHENS' *Laws Rel. to the Cl.* 351; STEER'S *Par. L.* Clive 107.

<sup>g</sup> WATSON'S *Cl. L.* 39.

<sup>h</sup> 1 *Roll. Rep.* 57; 1 *Sid.* 281; GIBS. 206.

<sup>i</sup> *Starkey v. Watlington* (Chw. of) 2 *Salk.* 547.

<sup>k</sup> GIBS. *Cod.* 216; *Turner v. Baynes.* 2 *H. Bl.* 550.

<sup>l</sup> WATSON'S *Cl. L.* 399; *Hardman v. Ringwood.* *Cro. Elz.* 145. 179; *Fetherston's* (Chw. of) *case.* 1 *Leon.* 177; *Rex v. Rice.* *Comb.* 417; *Tarlour v. Parner.* 1 *Vent.* 89.

<sup>m</sup> *Methold & Wynn.* 1 *Roll.* 393.

In respect of *Gifts, &c.*—A Clergyman, or any other person, may give or dedicate *Goods* to God's service in a Church, and deliver them into the custody of the Churchwardens, by which the property is immediately changed.<sup>n</sup> And further, if a man erect a *Pew* in a Church, or hang up a *Bell* in the steeple, they immediately become Church Goods, though they are not expressly given to the Church, and he may not afterwards remove them; if he do, the Churchwardens may sue him.<sup>o</sup> Similarly, an action of trespass was sustained by the Churchwardens against the Parson for breaking the *Bells*, though the Parson pleaded that he and others purchased the *Bells* with their own money, and put them up; because when put up, they were consecrated to the Church. Likewise, if he take the *Organ* out of the Church, they may have an action of trespass for it; for the *Organ* belongs to the Parishioners, and not to the Parson.<sup>p</sup>

*Loan.*—Any *Goods* or *Ornaments* supplied to the Church by way of *loan* must be entered in the Churchwardens' Book, and acknowledged as such by their signatures; otherwise, if it remain after such Churchwardens' year of office, their successors not being, or not choosing to be, cognizant of the fact, may possibly refuse to surrender them; and it would be a difficult task to compel them to deliver up possession.

In the *Bishop's Private Chapel*, the *Ornaments* appertain to the 'See,' as was decided in the *Bp. of Carlisle's* case<sup>q</sup>; and which was declared by LORD COKE in *Corwen v. Pym* (12 Co. 105.) as good law: GIBSON likewise says, that the *Ornaments* of a Chapel of a preceding Bishop are in succession. (Cod. 171.).

IV. *Repair of the GOODS, &c.* —The ORNAMENTS and GOODS of the Church *necessary* for the performance of Divine Service, and which are imposed by the RUBRICS and CANONS, must be provided, and kept in repair, by the CHURCHWARDENS at the cost of the Parish. If it were not so, and the Parish should refuse to provide the *Surplice*, the *Bible*, or the *Prayer Book*, the Minister would be prevented from performing, and certainly it is presumed could not be compelled to perform, the Service; and thus the majority of the Rate-payers might place their Parish under an interdict.—CRIPPS' *L. Rel. to Ch. &c.* 419.

<sup>n</sup> Degge's *P. C.* Ellis. 219; 11 Hen. 4. 12.

<sup>o</sup> *Starkey v. Watlington* (Chw. of) 2 Salk. 547.

<sup>p</sup> 1 ROL. Abr. Chw. A.

<sup>q</sup> 21. Edw. 3. 48.



In *Cooper v. Wickham* it was declared to be 'the duty of the CHURCHWARDENS to provide articles necessary for the decent performance of Divine Service, and, if they have not funds, they are bound to take every step they legally can to procure them.' (2 Curt. 312, 313).—WADDILOVE'S *Digest of Cases*. p. 104.

But in addition to the necessary GOODS, there are many other articles for which no provision is made by any especial law; such are *Galleries*, more *Bells* than one, *Organs*, *Clocks*, *Chimes*, *Royal Arms*, *Pulpit-cloths*, *cushions*, *mats*, *brushes*, *stoves*, &c., and the *Vestry-furniture*, with the salaries of the *Organist*, *Ringers*, *Pew-openers*, and others. If any of these things, says SIR WM. SCOTT, have been provided with the consent of the Parishioners in Vestry, and with the sanction of the Ordinary; or if they have been supplied from time immemorial, then the Parish is properly chargeable with their repairs, or their renewal. But if any new ORNAMENT were to be set up or added to the Church, without the consent of the Parish, then, it appears, the Parish could not be chargeable for its repair or preservation. Very much however depends upon the discretion of the Ordinary, who will take into consideration the particular circumstances of the Parish. (*Burton-on-Trent* case).

The majority of the Parishioners in Vestry may in some cases decide as to the necessity of repairs. In the case of *Nemson v. Baldry*, where the Communion-Table of ancient time had been placed in the Chancel, and there were ancient Rails about it which were out of repair, the Parishioners at a Meeting had resolved to repair the Chancel and Rails, and to replace the Table there, and raise the floor some steps higher for the sake of greater decency. Upon a refusal to pay the Rate, and a prohibition prayed, the Court inclined that the Parishioners might do these things, for they are compellable to put things in decent order; and as to the degrees of order and decency, there is no rule but as the Parishioners, by a majority, do agree. (Far. 70.)—BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* I. 368; CRIPPS' *L. Rel. to Ch. & Cl.* 421.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) lays it down as a general rule—'that as to all things necessary, the Parish must provide, continue, and repair them. As to things not absolutely necessary, the Parish need neither provide them in the first instance, nor continue and repair if they have been already provided, except by wish and consent of the majority. But if the majority have voted a Rate for that purpose, and the purpose appear reasonable under the circumstances, it will be upheld and enforced against dissentients. The Parishioners therefore have no reason to object to a Faculty for erecting any thing on the ground of future expence, because the majority will always have the remedy in their own hands on that point.' (p. 421.)—*Laws Rel. to Ch. & Clergy*.

We will now speak in detail of the GOODS and ORNAMENTS of the Church in use at the present day. Many have been long familiar to our Congregations, while others, particularly those of modern introduction, are from their rare occurrence less easily understood as to their application, and consequently, in some few instances, have been looked upon by the people with grave suspicion. They all however must necessarily come under our review, and by the mere mention of them we neither imply our advocacy, nor our reprobation, of their use. To determine indeed what *Ornaments* may legally be adopted, and what can authoritatively be prohibited, is a task of no small difficulty, nor is it pretended here to be accomplished. We will however give the arguments on both sides, leaving it to the discrimination, and the judgment of the Reader to decide which recommends itself with the most preponderating force.

First of all, and upon the general subject, may be quoted the opinion of an influential Ritualist of the preceding age, *Bp. Cosins*.

BISHOP COSINS (*ob.* 1672.), commenting upon the *Rubric* under discussion, says—‘The particulars of these *Ornaments*, both of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, as in the end of the Act of Uniformity (of *Eliz.* quoted in page 277, *supra*), are referred not to the 5th of *Edward VI.*, as the Service itself is in the beginning of that Act, for in that 5th year were all *Ornaments* taken away, but a *Surplice* only, both from Bishops, and Priests, and all other Ministers, and nothing was left for the Church but a *Font*, a *Table*, and a *linen Cloth* upon it, at the time of the Communion only; but to the 2nd year of that King, when his *first Service Book*, and *Injunctions* were in force by authority of *Parliament*. And in these Books many other ORNAMENTS are appointed; as *two Lights* to be set upon the Altar or Communion-Table, a *Cope* or *Vestment* for the Priest and for the Bishop; besides their *Albs*, *Surplices*, and *Rockets*, the Bishop’s *Crosier-staff*, to be holden by him at his Ministration and Ordinations, and those *Ornaments of the Church*, which by former Laws, not then abrogated, were in use, by virtue of the Statute, 25 *Henry VIII.* (given in page 265); and for them the Provincial Constitutions are to be consulted, such as have not been repealed, standing then in the 2nd year of King *Edward VI.*, and being still in force by virtue of this *RUBRIC*, and *Act of Parliament*.’—(After remarking upon *Calvin’s* and *Bucer’s* objections, and defending the use of the *two Lights* on the Altar, to which we shall presently revert, the Bishop adds)—‘It was well known, that the LORD TREASURER BURLEIGH, who was no friend to superstition or Popery, used them constantly in his Chapel with other

'Ornaments of *Fronts, Palls, and Books*, upon his Altar. The 'like did BP. ANDREWS, &c.....To this head we refer the *Organ*, 'the *Font* and *Altar*, the *Communion-Table*, and the *Pulpit*, with 'the *Coverings*, and *Ornaments* of them all; together with the '*Paten*, *Chalice*, and *Corporas*, which were all in use in the '*2nd of Edward VI. by the authority of the Acts of Parliament* 'then made.' (p. 17.)—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.*

These remarks of BP. COSINS have guided the judgment of many of the stricter Rubricians of the present day. Yet we will annex a few more modern opinions:—

*The late BISHOP OF NORWICH (Dr. Stanley)*, speaking of the restoration of Churches, says—'I cannot understand the arguments of those who would oppose their development (of our gifts and talents) to the fullest extent in the service of Him by whom they were imparted; and it is upon this principle, therefore, that 'I would encourage the introduction of the highest exercise of art 'in all that relates to *Ecclesiastical Architecture*, and *decoration*, 'internal, as well as external....I need scarcely remind you, that, 'had not Religion patronized and encouraged the one and the 'other (Sculptors and Painters), the most distinguished professors 'in these sister arts would have remained in obscurity. I am 'aware of the reply,—they pander, it is said, to idolatry, and may 'again become the objects of superstitious worship. In a former 'age, when the minds of men were under the control of a superstitious and designing Priesthood, such reasoning might have 'weight, but I must confess, I cannot now hear it without mingled 'sentiments of pain and surprise. In our more enlightened age, 'such fears are surely exaggerated: let us rather cherish it as the 'especial privilege of our Protestant faith, that we can now use, without danger, what was once a temptation to Popery....Instead of 'entertaining fears on account of this encouragement to arts displayed in *Painting*, and *Sculptures*, and *Ecclesiastical decoration*, 'I would look rather with hope to the promotion of a purer and 'more enlightened taste amongst the people, and that so they 'might become important aids in education.'—*Charge. 1845.*

*The BISHOP OF WORCESTER (Dr. Pepys)*, on the other hand, —when animadverting upon the attempts to revive the *Ornaments* and *Forms* supposed to have been used in the Churches of antiquity, says,—'A *stone Altar* has been preferred to a *Communion-Table*, a *Lectern* to a *Reading-Desk*, *Sedilia* have been prepared 'in a Church where only one Clergyman was ever likely to officiate, 'the obsolete use of a *Credence-Table* revived, *Candlesticks* placed on 'a *Communion-Table*, never intended to be lighted, and the walls 'covered with *Texts of Scripture*, painted in divers colours, and in 'old English, which never could be read; and thus we have heard 'much of a *Reredos*, a *Rood-screen*, a *Piscina*, and a *Hagioscope*, 'as essential to a truly Ecclesiastical structure. Now, I object to 'the revival of these long disused ORNAMENTS in our Churches, 'not only on account of the additional expence which they entail ' (though this is a consideration by no means to be disregarded in 'cases where the sum to be expended is raised by the contributions 'of others, who may not approve such an application of them),

'but because I think them further reprehensible as having a tendency to convey a false notion of the purposes for which we, as Protestants, assemble in our Churches and Chapels....It may be doubted therefore whether there is much discretion in the attempt to restore *Ecclesiastical Ornaments*, which, originating at a time when vital religion was almost lost in a mass of ritual observances, and superstitious formalities, are no longer accordant with the more spiritual character of our Reformed Church.'—*Charge*. 1845.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), observes—'In a legal point of view, it is not very clear what '*Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof*' were used in the Church of England by authority of Parliament in the 2nd of Edward VI.; but nothing is more reasonable, in questions concerning the interpretation of a doubtful law, than to enquire how the practice of people was in times by-gone; because what they did when the reason and sense of the Law were best perceived, and what the Law-giver allowed them to do in the obedience of it, may best be supposed to be that which he intended (p. 351.)....In order to ascertain what *Ornaments, &c.* were in use in the 2nd year of Edward VI. reference must be had to contemporaneous documents.' (p. 352.).—The author then quotes the *Inventories* of several Churches, enumerating the *Ornaments* in their possession at that date, yet it is not specified which of those Ornaments were then in actual use.—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

After these opposite opinions, we may pass to the consideration of the several Goods and ORNAMENTS which are now to be met with in our Churches, taking the order in which they are enumerated in the following *Table*. Those which must of necessity be provided, if they are required, at the cost of the Parish, are in *Italic* letters, to distinguish them from such as are only optional, and from those which are of but modern introduction, and of rare occurrence.

#### THE ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>Alms-Basin.</i>                 | 16. Lights.                            |
| 2. — <i>Chest.</i>                    | 17. Litany-Stool.                      |
| 3. <i>Bells</i> (and 'Bell-Ringers'). | 18. Monuments.                         |
| 4. <i>Bier.</i>                       | 19. Organ (and 'Organist').            |
| 5. <i>Books.</i>                      | 20. <i>Parish-Chest.</i>               |
| 6. Clocks, Chimes.                    | 21. <i>Pulpit.</i>                     |
| 7. <i>Communion-Plate, &amp;c.</i>    | 22. <i>Reading-Desk.</i>               |
| 8. — <i>Table.</i>                    | 23. Royal-Arms.                        |
| 9. <i>Coverings, Cloths, &amp;c.</i>  | 24. <i>Scripture Sentences.</i>        |
| 10. <i>Creduce-Table.</i>             | 25. <i>Sedilia.</i>                    |
| 11. Cross.                            | 26. <i>Surplice.</i>                   |
| 12. Evergreens, Flowers.              | 27. <i>Table of Degrees.</i>           |
| 13. <i>Font.</i>                      | 28. <i>Ten-Commandments.</i>           |
| 14. Images, and Pictures.             | 29. Vestry-Furniture, and other Goods. |
| 15. Lectern.                          |  |

*Alms-Basin.*

The ALMS-BASIN, or *Offertory-Dish* (*Offertorium*), is ordered by the RUBRIC of the Liturgy following the Offertory Sentences in the 'Communion Service,' and is to be provided at the cost of the Parish: thus—

¶ 'Whilst these sentences (the Offertory) are in reading, the 'Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit Person appointed for that purpose, shall receive the Alms for the Poor, and other devotions of the People, in a decent BASON to be provided by the Parish for that purpose.'—(1662).

Previous to the last *Review* of the PRAYER-BOOK the Offertory Alms were deposited in the '*Poor Men's Box*.'

In the *First Liturgy* of Edward VI. the RUBRIC ran—

1549. 'In the meantime whiles the Clerks do sing the Offertory, so many as are disposed shall offer unto the POOR MEN'S BOX every one according to his ability and charitable mind.' (1549)—KEELING. 185.

In the three intervening *Liturgies* the RUBRIC was—

1552-1604. 'Then shall the Churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the People, and put the same into the POOR MEN'S BOX; &c.' (1552, 1559, 1604)—KEELING. 184, 185.

The substitution of a *Basin* for the *Poor-Box*, MR. ROBERTSON supposes, 'gave a sanction to the 'collection of money for pious purposes in general.' (*How shall we Conf. to Lit.* 191.). Be that as it may, our concern here is less with the reason, than the fact, that a change was made in the receptacle for the Alms; and Rubrical conformity therefore requires a *Basin* to be used, and not a *Box*, or *Bag*, as is frequently the case. The practice of using the *lid* of the Chalice, or of the Flagon, is very reprehensible.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742.), speaking of these *Alms*, says—'They were ordered to put (them) into the *Poor Man's Box*; not, I presume, into that fixed in the Church, but into a *little Box* which

'the Churchwardens or some other proper persons carried about with them in their hands, as is still the custom at the Temple Church in London. Now indeed they are ordered to make use of a *'decent Basin to be provided by the Parish for that purpose.'* (p. 271)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

Among modern writers we have the following—

Rev. W. DATES describes the *Offertorium* as—'A vessel, or *'piece of silk or linen* to receive the Offerings in....This was *'totally distinct from the Poor-Box.'* (p. 323.)—*Lect. on Christ. Antiq. and Ritual.*

Rev. R. HART speaks of the *Offertorium* as—'A large deep *'metal dish*, embossed in the centre with some Scriptural subject, *'or sacred emblem.* That which I have seen is of brass and *'circular, having the Annunciation represented in the centre, and *'a legend round its rim.'* (p. 236.)—*Ecl. Records.**

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—'The Churchwardens can be compelled by mandamus to provide a *'decent Basin*;' and collecting the Alms in anything but a *'decent Basin*,' is unauthorized by the RUBRIC; *'expressio unius est exclusio alterius*,' is a rule of law very applicable to this RUBRIC. Ministers and Churchwardens act in a reprehensible manner when they deviate from the letter of the law, as they sometimes do, by using *'wooden Boxes, and leathern Bags.* Such expedients can only be excusable, when they are rendered necessary by the largeness of the congregation; and then the Alms, or the *Bags or Boxes* containing them, should be received in the *Basin* by the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, and so presented to the Priest.' (p. 1170.)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

\*.\* Deep circular *Alms-Basins* of Dutch manufacture, and made of brass, or latten, may now be commonly met with. They are embossed in imitation of the antique; and the centre design usually represents either the 'Fall of Man', or the 'Grapes of Eschol.'

**ALMS-PLATES.**—In addition to the *Alms-Basin*, two or more *Alms-Plates* for Charity, or Missionary collections, are frequently provided by the Churchwardens, but not of necessity. Their appearance among the Church furniture may be more generally ascribed to the liberality of the Incumbent, or to the pious bounty of some Parishioner. They are commonly of carved oak, walnut, or beech wood; sometimes of brass, occasionally of silver, or gold.

For *Charitable Collections*, gathered from Pew to Pew, later times have introduced in some places the use of BAGS (*'Almoniers'*) attached to a staff; they

are manufactured of various materials, — leather, silk, and velvet—and more or less ornamented.\*

### *Alms-Chest.*

The *Alms-Chest*, or *Poor-Box*, is directed to be set up in Churches by the 84th CANON ; thus—

‘The Churchwardens shall provide and have,....a *strong Chest*, with a *hole* in the upper part thereof, to be provided at ‘the *charge of the Parish*....having *three keys*, of which one ‘shall remain in the custody of the Parson, Vicar, or Curate, ‘and the other two in the custody of the Churchwardens for the ‘time being ; which *Chest* they shall set and fasten in the most ‘convenient place, to the intent that the Parishioners may put ‘into it, their *Alms* for their poor neighbours....The which ‘*Alms* and devotion of the People, the keeper of the keys shall ‘yearly, quarterly, or oftener, as need requireth, take out of the ‘*Chest*, and distribute the same in the presence of most of the ‘Parish, or of six of the chief of them, to be truly and faithfully ‘delivered to their most poor and needy members.’—CANON 84.

The Statute of 27 Hen. VIII. c. 25. (A. D. 1535.) for the ‘Punishment of sturdy Vagabonds’—requiring ‘the money of all and every ‘the foresaid free and charitable collections shall be kept in the ‘common *Coffer* or *Box* standing in the Church of every Parish’—is now obsolete. STEPHENS’ *Ecl. Stat.* 196.

\*. \* The CANON, above quoted, is derived almost word for word from the *Injunctions* of Edward VI. 1546-7. (CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 17, 47.), where the *Alms-Chest* was required to be fixed ‘near unto the high Altar.’ BP. RIDLEY in his Visitation Articles in 1550 (*ib.* 81.) ; the *Injunctions* and Visitation Articles of *Elizabeth* in 1559 (*ib.* 189, 212) ; and of ABP. PARKER in 1569 (*ib.* 321), all enforce the same ; except that they order the *Chest* to be ‘fastened in the most convenient place.’

ARCHDEACON SHARP, after remarking upon the argument in this CANON as being—‘borrowed from King Edward VIth’s ‘INJUNCTIONS in 1547, when it had its full weight, and applied ‘before it was altogether out of date, in the year of the CANONS, ‘viz. 1603,’—says further, that it ‘can have no place or use at this ‘time of day ; and as most other arguments for the supply of the ‘*Poor’s Box* or *Chest of Alms*, are almost out of date with us, the ‘*Poor’s Boxes* themselves being so in most places ; I do suppose ‘that the purpose of this CANON may be thought sufficiently an-

\* Very elaborate patterns may be seen at Mr. Gilbert French’s manufactory at Bolton, at about 15s. each ; where also may be obtained *Alms-Basins* of metal of various Ecclesiastical designs ; from 25s. to 50s. a-piece. *Alms-Plates* of carved walnut, or other wood, and of proper character can readily be procured from Messrs. Cox & Son’s, in Southampton-street, Strand, at about 21s.

'swered, if Ministers be careful to recommend Alms-giving to 'their people at all proper seasons.' (p. 250. n.)—*On the Rubr. and Canons*. Charge, A. D. 1749.

SHEPHERD (ob. 1804.), in his time, implies that the *Alms-Chest* had grown out of use, adding—'from this *Box* the Poor of every Parish were in a great measure supported, from the abolition of 'the Religious Houses, till their compulsory maintenance came to 'be established by law.'—*Eluc. of B. of C. Pr.* vol. ii. p. 194.

The necessity of this *Chest* having in later times been in a great measure superseded by the legislative provisions for the support of the Poor, the '*Poor Man's Box*' is rarely seen in our Churches: yet, if it is required, the Churchwardens can be compelled to provide one. Occasionally, mutilated portions of this venerable relic meet the eye, affording historical reminiscences of past ages; and here and there its modern restoration will appeal to the Christian charity of the passing Worshipper, but this is all: negligence, or indifference, has suffered the ancient *Alms-Chest* to go to ruin, and custom till lately had tacitly prohibited its restoration.

REV. G. A. POOLE, speaking of the structure of the *Alms-Chest*, says—'The most convenient place is just within the Door, 'to the right hand of the person entering... The general and best 'form is a simple post of oak,\* rising about as high as the hand, 'with the top cut out into a little Box, upon which the lid, with the 'hole in it, shuts down on strong hinges, which bind over on the 'opposite side into the fastenings of the padlock. There is very 'seldom any attempt at decoration in these old *Alms-Chests*, nor 'indeed do they require it.' (p. 95)—*On Churches*.

*Altar-Chairs.* See '*Sedilia*' infra.

*Altar-Cloths.* See '*Coverings*' infra.

*Altar-Piece.* See '*Images and Pictures*' infra.

### *Bells, and Bell-Ringers.*

With respect to BELLS, we possess very few authorities, Legal or Ecclesiastical, that afford any very practical directions: and what there are, they are

\* *Alms-Chests* of this construction are offered in *Messrs. Cox & Son's* catalogue at a *guinea-and-a-half*; and ornamented *bracket Boxes* to project from the wall, and encircled by an Ecclesiastical shield or escutcheon, from 30s. to 40s.



very far from being satisfactory or decisive. It appears that *one* BELL is all that is absolutely required by the *Rubric* and the *Canons*, to be provided of necessity in Churches at the charge of the Parish; and this *Bell* is to serve the office of a *Call-Bell* to the Divine Services, and of a *Passing-Bell* at Deaths, and to toll at Burials. The use of the '*Call-Bell*' is thus imposed by the RUBRIC, and CANON.

The RUBRIC is

¶ '*And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish-Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same (Morning and Evening Prayer) in the Parish-Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a Bell to be tolled thereunto ('shall toll a Bell thereto' 1552, 1559, 1604.) a convenient time before he begin, that the people ('such as be disposed,' 1552-9), may come to hear God's Word and to pray with him.*'—(1552-1662). Pref. of B. of Com. Pr.

The CANON refers to the *Wednesday* and *Friday* Services; thus—

'Upon *Wednesdays* and *Fridays* weekly, though they be not Holy-Days, the Minister at the accustomed hours of Service, shall resort to the Church or Chapel, and warning being given to the People by *tolling of a Bell*, shall say the Litany, &c.'—CANON 15.

\*.\* This CANON is derived word for word from the *Injunctions* of ELIZABETH (1559).—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* I. 196.

The '*Passing-Bell*' at Deaths, and the tolling at Burials are thus enjoined by another CANON—

'When any is passing out of this life a *Bell shall be tolled*, and the Minister shall not then slack to do his last duty. And after the party's death, if it so fall out, there shall be rung no more that one short peal, and one other before the *Burial*, and one other after the *Burial*.'—CANON 67.

\*.\* This CANON we also find almost verbatim among the *Injunctions* of ELIZABETH (1559), and in the '*Book of Advertisements*' (1564).—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* I. 207, 292.

Although the *tolling* of this BELL is here prescribed for *four* distinct occasions, modern custom has limited it to two: first, *after* the death of a Parishioner, to which the term '*Passing-Bell*' has been incorrectly transferred; and the second time, during

the procession of the *Funeral* from the house of the deceased to the Church-gate, or entrance. The proper Officer for tolling the *Call-Bell*, the *Passing-Bell* and the *Funeral-Bell*, is the *SEXTON*, (the *Ostiarivus* of the Roman Church), as is laid down in most law authorities (BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* III. 602, 80; ROGERS' *Ecc. L.* 911; GIES. *Cod.* 99.); and his duty is to toll what is now called the '*Passing-Bell*' immediately after the death of a Parishioner, and not, as is too often the case, at his convenience; and it should be continued for a certain specified time. It is usual to mark the distinction between a Man, Woman, and Child, who may be deceased, by using a larger or smaller Bell where there are several; or by a little deviation in the method of *tolling*, or '*striking out*', when there is but one. At *Funerals* also there should be a prescribed time imposed for '*tolling*;' and the Bell ought always to cease when the OFFICIATING MINISTER meets the corpse. The remedy for any neglect of duty on the part of the *Sexton*, is, of course, where reprimand is ineffectual, to withhold the '*fec*'; for when there is no work performed there can be no remuneration demanded. Continued negligence, or refusal, will call for the official interference of the Churchwardens, who must '*present*' the offending Functionary at the next Visitation. He cannot be peremptorily discharged, if his appointment has been unconditional, because the Office is a '*freehold*'. With regard to the two other '*pcals*' spoken of in the Canon, and which have grown into desuetude, they cannot, it is said, be compulsorily imposed on the existing Officer unless additional emolument be awarded him; so that if this be objected to, any alteration in this respect must await the change of *Sexton*.

BP. WREN, in his directions to his Diocese of Norwich (A.D. 1636), adverts to the different styles of ringing, then prevailing, in these words—'That there be the same manner of *ringing* and *tolling* of *Bells* to Church on Holy-Days, as is used on Sundays, and that 'there be no difference of ringing to Church, when there is a Sermon, more than when there is none; excepting the *Knells* for *Funerals*.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* II. 207.

BP. MONTAGUE in his Visitation Articles (A.D. 1638.), inquires—'When any party is in extremity is there a '*Passing*

'Bell' tolled, that the neighbours thereby moved, may (remembering their own mortality) recommend his state unto God in their private prayers, &c.?'—And again: 'When he is departed, doth the Bell ring out his Knell, that others may take notice, and thank God for his deliverance out of this vale of misery? Both which tolling and ringing out be in many places neglected.'—(Camb. Ed. p. 76. quoted in *Hier. Anglic.* p. 393.).

WHEATLY says of the *Funeral-Bells*—'The *'Passing-Bell'* indeed is now generally disused, and only the short '*peal*' continued, which the CANON orders to be rung after the party's death. But the former was certainly of much more use, to give notice to all within the sound of it, to put up their last and most affectionate prayers for their dying neighbour, and to help their friend in those extremities which themselves must assuredly one day feel.' (p. 447). . . . 'Before the *Burial* a short '*peal*' is to be rung, to give the relations and neighbours notice of the time, and to call them to pay their last attendance to their deceased friend.' (p. 464). . . . 'The whole solemnity (of the Burial Service) is concluded with another '*peal*,' which the same CANON orders.' (p. 480)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of C. Pr.*

By other CANONS it is *forbidden* to ring Bells on superstitious occasions, and at untimely seasons, unless by permission of the *Minister* and *Churchwardens* conjointly:—thus

*On Superstitious Occasions forbidden.*—'The CHURCHWARDENS or Questmen, and their Assistants, shall not suffer . . . the BELLS to be rung superstitiously, upon Holy-Days or Eves abrogated by the Book of Common Prayer, nor at any other times, without good cause to be allowed by the MINISTER of the place, and by themselves.'—CANON 88.

*At Untimely Seasons forbidden.*—'In all Visitations of Bishops and Archdeacons, the CHURCHWARDENS, or Questmen, and Side-men, shall truly and personally present the names of all those which . . . by untimely ringing of Bells . . . shall hinder the MINISTER or Preacher.'—CANON 111.

\*. The latter CANON (111th) seems to be derived from the '*Injunctions*' of EDWARD VI. (in 1547), and of ELIZABETH (1559), where it is ordered—'And in the time of the Litany, of the Mass ('of the Common Prayer': *Inj. of Eliz.*), of the Sermon, and when the Priest readeth the Scripture to the Parishioners. . . . all ringing and knolling of Bells shall be utterly forborne at that time, except one Bell in convenient time to be rung or knolled before the Sermon.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* I. 15. 187.).

Such are the authoritative instructions we possess with respect to *Church-Bells*; and we have now to consider the two important questions of—

(a) Who is to provide and repair the Bells, and the Ropes?

(b) In whom is vested their custody, and control?

**I. Provision, and Repair.**—By a Constitution of ARB. WINCHELSEY (A. D. 1294-1313), which has the sanction of immemorial custom, as well as, it is supposed, the force of Common Law (see page 265. n.),—‘The Parishioners shall find at their own charge *Bells with Ropes.*’ (LYNDWOOD. 252.)—Quoted in BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* I. 134. 370; CRIPPS. 418; STEPHENS’ *L. Rel. to Cl.* 135: also in DR. HOOK’S *Ch. Dict.* Art. ‘BELLS.’

Our writers on *Ecclesiastical Law*, in their observations on Church GOODS and ORNAMENTS in general, also say,—‘There are many other articles for which *no provision* is made by any *special law*, and therefore must be referred to the general power of the CHURCHWARDENS, with the consent of the major part of the Parishioners as aforesaid, and under the direction of the Ordinary: such as...adding new *Bells*, and of consequence, as it seemeth, *salaries for the Ringers.*’—(BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* I. 374; CRIPPS. 419; STEPHENS’ *L. Rel. to Cl.* 135.).

Only one BELL, it seems, can be required to be provided at the charge of the Parish: this the following authorities assert, and almost in the same language,—

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) mentions among the Articles necessarily to be supplied by the Parish, ‘a *Bell* to ring to Church, and to toll at Funerals *with the Ropes* (LYND. 250; 3 Hagg. 16.); ‘but no more than one *Bell* appears to be necessary.’ (p. 418)—*Laws Rel. to Ch. and Cl.*

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*), speaking of Churchwardens, says—‘They ought also, at the cost of the Parish, to provide....a *Bell* and *Rope* to ring to Church, and toll at Funerals. (3 Hagg. C. R. 10.)’. (p. 46)—*Chm. Guide.*

MR. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—‘The Parish at their own charge, shall find *Bells with Ropes*; but a *Bell* to ring to Church and toll at Funerals is all that is legally requisite. (3 Hagg. 16.)’—(p. 155.). *Ecc. Law.*

MR. STEER (*Barrister at-Law*) says—‘*Bells* and *Ropes*.... are likewise to be furnished at the cost of the Parish (LYND. 252.). For *Bells* are not mere Ornaments; they are as necessary as the steeple, which is of no use without them. (*Woodward v. Makepeace.* 1 Salk. 164.)’—*Parish Law.* Ed. Clive. p. 35.

All the above opinions appear to rest on the decision of SIR WILLIAM WYNNE, in the case of *Peorce & Hughes v. Rector of Clapham* (3 Hagg. 16.), who thus decided—‘A *Ring of Bells* cannot be provided for without expence, as for *Ropes, tuning, &c.* Suppose at one time the Parishioners are willing to take upon themselves such expences, and at another time refuse; the Ordinary could not compel the Parishioners to keep the *Bells* in order, because they are in the Steeple. *There must be a BELL to ring to Church, and to toll at Funerals, but that is all.*’—(Quoted in BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* I. 135; C. G. PRIDEAUX’ *Chm. Guide.* 201; STEPHENS’ *L. Rel. to Cl.* 135.).

Chief Justice HOLT—in the case of *Woodward v. Makepeace*, (referred to by MR. STEER, above), where it was contended that *Bells* being mere Ornaments, therefore a Parishioner is not taxable for their repair—decided, ‘If he be an inhabitant as to the

'Church, which is confessed, how can he not be an inhabitant as to the *Ornaments* of the Church.' (1 Salk. 164.)

So in the case of *Smith & Willis v. Dixon*: it was declared—'If the Majority of the Vestry think fit to make a *Rate* for the repair of the *Bells* of the Church, such *Rate* may be enforced.' (2 Curt. 271.)—WADDILOVE'S *Digest of Cases*, p. 104.

The *Curfew Bell* at Evening, a daily Morning Bell, or perhaps only on the *Sunday Morning*; or a Bell at other times and seasons, is rung in some Parishes by immemorial custom, and the expence charged upon the Church-Rate; or, it may be, on some endowment fund. This, of course, is not likely to be set aside, or suspended.

II. CUSTODY, and CONTROL.—The property, and therefore the *Custody* of the BELLS, whether one or more, as of other Church Goods, is in the CHURCHWARDENS, who may bring actions in the Spiritual or Temporal Courts for their damage, if injured; and for their recovery, if stolen. (See page 498.)

\*. It was declared, in *Jackson v. Adams*, with respect to the *Bell-Ropes*, not to be actionable to say of a CHURCHWARDEN that 'he stole the Bell-Ropes of his own Parish.' (2 Bing. N. C. 402.) It was also decided in *Starkey v. Watlington* (Chw. of), that the Churchwardens could maintain a prohibition to stay a suit in the Spiritual Court for the abstraction of *two Bells* out of the Steeple; and, having a right of property, could bring an action of trover at common law.—(2 Salk. 547.).

The *Control of the Bells* is the next question for our consideration, and is one of some moment. It has long been a matter of doubt whether it lay with the INCUMBENT, or with the CHURCHWARDENS. The following opinion on the subject was given by DR. PHILLIMORE.—

'Although the Churchwardens may concur in directing the ringing or tolling of the Bells on certain public and private occasions; the Incumbent, nevertheless, has so far the control over the *Bells* of the Church, that he may prevent the CHURCHWARDENS from ringing or tolling them at undue hours, and without just cause. Indeed, as the *freehold* of the Church is vested in the INCUMBENT, there is no doubt that he has a right to the *custody* of the *keys of the Church*, subject to the granting admission to the CHURCHWARDENS for purposes connected with the due execution of their Office. Proceedings may be instituted in the Ecclesiastical Court against CHURCHWARDENS, who have

'violently and illegally persisted in *ringing the Bells without the consent of the INCUMBENT*. The citation may be as follows—"For *"violently and outrageously breaking into the Belfry of the Parish Church of ———, and without the leave and permission of the Rector, and in defiance of his authority, several times ringing the Bells in the said Church."* I have not been able to discover any judicial decision directly upon this point, but the preceding statement is in accordance with the opinions given by several eminent Civilians upon the subject. The exclusive right of the Minister to the custody of the *Key* of the Church is clearly laid down by SIR JOHN NICHOLL in *Lee v. Matthews*. 1830. (3 Hagg. 173.):—"The MINISTER has in the first instance the right to the possession of the *Key*, and the Churchwardens have only the custody of the Church under him. If the MINISTER refuses access to the Church on fitting occasions, he will be set right on application and complaint to higher authorities."—(quoted in BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 135; C. G. PRIDEAUX' *Chw. Guide*, 270; STEPHEN'S *L. Rel. to the Cl.* 136. n. Also in DR. HOOK'S *Ch. Dict.* Art. "BELLS"; in *Christian Remembrancer*, November, 1833.)

DR. LUSHINGTON also considers that the *consent of the Minister* is necessary before the BELLS can be rung; and that the Minister has the power to limit the time of the ringing, and that the *Ringers* are bound to obey him. He says—"The consent of the MINISTER, whether *Incumbent* or *Curate*, is necessary to authorize the ringing of *Bells* in the Church; and the consent of either, or of both the Churchwardens without the Minister's consent, is not sufficient. The *Minister's consent* to the ringing of the BELLS must *always* be had; if the two Churchwardens differ, the consent of the Minister and one Churchwarden is sufficient, but the consent of the Minister against both Churchwardens would not justify the ringing, nor would the consent of both Churchwardens against the *Minister* authorize it. The Minister has authority to limit the time of ringing, and the *Ringers* are bound to obey him. And no person has a right without the consent of the MINISTER, (whether *Incumbent* or *Curate*) to place *Flags*, *Garlands*, or any thing else, either in or upon the Church, or in the 'Church-yard.' (*Opinion* given to REV. — SHARPE, Rector of *Charlton*, Somerset; quoted in the *Bath Chronicle*, January 4th, 1821; and in the *Christian Remembrancer*, June, 1822. page 378.)

Again, DR. LUSHINGTON was consulted on the following case—The REV. THOS. BABB, the licensed and resident Curate of *Chardstock*, Dorsetshire, together with the Churchwardens, having refused the BELLS to the *Ringers*, on the abandonment of the 'Pains and Penalties Bill,' the *Belfry* door was forced open for three successive nights, and the *Ringers* rang the Bells in defiance. Mr. BABB applied to a Justice of the Peace, who committed the *Ringers*, for refusing to find bail (though gratuitously offered), to the next Sessions to answer for a riot and forcibly breaking open the *Belfry* door. But the grand Jury having ignored the Bill of indictment, the *Ringers* brought an action against the REV. T. BABB for a malicious prosecution. The case put to DR. LUSHINGTON was thus worded—"You are desired to advise on the propriety and expediency of taking any, and what steps, in the Ecclesiastical Court against the *Ringers*, for ringing after having been refused leave, and having been proceeded against in the tem-

poral Court, in the manner above stated, as an indictment has been preferred against the Curate for an assault, in trying to catch a man escaping from the *Belfry*—and an action for false imprisonment brought against him by one of the *Ringers*.?—The learned advocate thus replied: “With respect to the *ringing the Bells* in the manner stated, this is an Ecclesiastical offence, and may also be punished by the same Court. I do not think the proceedings in the temporal Court can, in any degree, affect the jurisdiction in the Ecclesiastical Court. It appears to me that the prosecution may now be carried on against the *Ringers*, if it be deemed expedient to do so. The proceedings may include the whole conduct of those individuals, but must be against each separately. The Court of the Church of Salisbury is the proper jurisdiction, and care must be taken that the citation be correct, and the Article agree with it.”—“STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.” *Doctors Commons*, Feb. 14, 1821”.—The prosecution, however, brought by the *Ringers* against the Rev. T. BABB, came on at Dorchester before Mr. Justice HOLROYD, March 17, 1821, when the learned Judge thus decided—“In order to support this action, it was necessary to establish *malice* on the part of the Defendant, who was not answerable, even if the magistrate had drawn a wrong conclusion from the facts stated; and that in point of law (though it might have been usual to ring without leave) yet the *power of refusing the Ringers resided in the Minister and Churchwardens*; and that the *Ringers* were wrong-doers in being in the *Belfry* without leave, whether the door had been broken open or not:—and that the conclusion drawn by the magistrate was, that the offence was a riot, and all the evidence supported it; and that no malice appeared to have actuated the Defendant, who had applied to the Constable to bail the Plaintiff, which the latter refused, although the charge of injury was for his being committed to gaol.” The Jury returned a *Verdict* for the Reverend Defendant. — (See *Christian Remembrancer*. June, 1822. p. 375—378).

*Use of Bells not restricted.*—Roman Catholics, and Dissenters, are not prohibited by any legal enactment from having Bells.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—“There does not seem to be any law against the use of *Bells* by *Roman Catholics*, or other Dissenters from the Established Church. In the south of Ireland many Roman Catholic Chapels have used Bells for years, and no proceedings have been taken against the parties.” (p. 135. n.)—*Laws Rel. to Cl.*

### [BELL-RINGERS.]

But we must now proceed to the subject of a ‘*Peal of Bells*,’ and their *Ringers*. Hitherto our remarks have applied for the most part to the single Bell enjoined in the RUBRIC and CANONS,

in so far as the questions of 'provision' and 'repair' are concerned.' Where, however, there is a *Peal of Bells*, and consequently a set of *Ringers*, the preservation of the one, and the remuneration of the other—when not secured out of the *Church-rates* by consent of the majority in Vestry assembled, (see page 498.)—are very frequently dependent upon the voluntary contributions of the Incumbent and the Parishioners; unless there is some endowment, or an immemorial and undisputed custom, independent of the Vestry, of laying the burden wholly, or in part, upon the *Church-rates*. No Canon, or Legal enactment, exists imposing on a Parish either the support of a *Peal of Bells*, or any provision for a body of *Ringers*, so that it generally depends upon the custom of the Parish, or the consent of the Vestry: yet, from whatever source the necessary funds arise, the control over the *Bells* and the *Ringings* still remains legally vested in the MINISTER and the CHURCHWARDENS conjointly, as laid down in the 88th CANON, which is confirmed, as we have shown above, by DR. PHILLIMORE, and DR. LUSHINGTON.

But since the freehold of the *Belfry*, inasmuch as it is a part of the Church, is in the *Incumbent*,—subject to the right of the Churchwardens, and the Sexton, to enter therein on all occasions that their respective duties may require,—the authority of the *Incumbent*, individually, must be greater and more effectual for the regulation of all matters connected with the use or abuse of the *Bells* than any other power in the Parish; he can maintain an action for trespass against any party breaking into the *Belfry*, or entering therein by a false key, or without his consent; and, according to the opinion of DR. PHILLIMORE (in page 499.), even against the *Churchwardens* themselves. We may venture to assert, therefore, that it is highly important that this power possessed by the *Incumbent* should not be suffered to remain so much in abeyance as in later times has been the case in most Parishes; but that whenever an occasion presents itself calling for its exercise in order to the preservation of decency and decorum in the *Belfry*, it should be brought to bear against the offending parties: not of course with severity, but in such a way that the authority shall at all times be promptly acknowledged, and its decisions readily acquiesced in.

These observations apply especially to the *Ringers*, for it is a notorious fact, that, generally speaking, there does not exist in connection with the Church, a more difficult class of men to keep in order and submission than the *Bell-Ringers*. It may in some measure be accounted for, perhaps, from the circumstance that no



degree of proficiency in the Art of Ringing is to be attained without considerable practice, and therefore it is only the idle, and those having much leisure on their hands, who can devote themselves to its acquirement. The natural consequence of employing such a class of men is, that should any of the Ringers misconduct themselves, and prove refractory, there is no one fitted to supersede them; and as they are themselves conscious of the impossibility of being readily supplanted, a spirit of independence reigns amongst them which will admit of no interference or control in any thing that relates to their particular avocation. Moreover, they generally take it upon themselves to train up whom they choose in their peculiar art, and the young disciples soon learn under the tutelage of their rough preceptors to claim as a kind of prescriptive right the privilege of succeeding without let or hindrance to the status of an 'old Ringer' whenever a vacancy may occur. Such a self-elected and exclusive body of illiterate, and, perhaps, idle men, as might be well imagined, think nothing of setting at defiance those orders and directions, whether of the *Minister*, or of the *Churchwardens*, which may be likely to interfere with their usual habits, or over-rule their private arrangements. They seem indeed to think that they are at perfect liberty to *ring* at any hour, and on any occasion they please, and in the style and manner they prefer; and that they have the right to impose for their performances at Marriages, and other occasions of rejoicing, whatever charge they may deem it necessary to demand. In many cases, however, the *Ringers* are open to argument and to reason, and when reproof is kindly administered, they will often strive to amend; and likewise when suggestions are proposed will gladly conform to what may be required. To prevent unpleasantness, or dissatisfaction, their conduct and proceedings should be regulated by certain distinct and definite *Rules*; which, to be of authority, must receive the sanction of the governing body, the MINISTER and CHURCHWARDENS: whose signatures, with those of the *Ringers* also as consenting parties, should be attached, to give them undisputed force and efficacy. Every departure from these *Rules* ought to be visited with some penal imposition that can be practically applied, such as a fine of greater or less magnitude according to the delinquency committed.

To lay down a *Code of Rules* in a work of this character capable of meeting all circumstances, customs, and localities, would be impossible. Much will also depend upon the source, as well as the amount of the available funds. We will, however, give a few *headings*—the suggestions of experience;—some of which may possibly

meet with general approbation, and concurrence, and be found applicable to other Parishes.

*Bells.*— (1) To be kept *clean* from ordnre of birds, &c.

(2) All injuries to the *Bells, Ropes, and Bell-frames* to be reported instantly to the CHURCHWARDENS.

*Belfry.*— (1) To be kept *clean*; and provided with *Pegs* for Hats and Coats; and with metal *Candlesticks* fixed to the walls.

(2) No *scores of Peals and Changes* to be scribbled about the Belfry, but to be written on a Board, and hung against the wall.

(3) No *Eating, Drinking, or Smoking* permitted in the Belfry.

(4) No *swearing, quarrelling or profanity* allowed.

(5) Damage to the *Doors, Windows, Ladders, and Belfry-floor* to be reported immediately to the CHURCHWARDENS.

(6) The *Keys* to be deposited where the INCUMBENT may direct.

*Ringers.*— (1) The *number* of Ringers not to exceed the number of the Bells.

(2) No Ringer to have an *Assistant* or '*Learner*' who is not approved of by the MINISTER.

(3) Only the *enrolled Ringers and Assistant-Ringers* to be admitted into the Belfry during the '*Ringings*.'

(4) Every *Ringer, and Assistant-Ringer*, to be members of the Church of England, and to attend *Divine Service* in the Church once at least on the Sunday.

(5) None to appear in the Belfry on Sunday in their *working-dress*.

(6) *Fines* to be deducted and applied as the Rules direct.

(7) *Fees and Emoluments* to be apportioned according to a prescribed scale, and on an appointed day,—yearly, half-yearly, or quarterly,—as set down in the Rules.

(8) A *Foreman or Captain* to be chosen, to maintain order, take care that there is no infringement of the Rules and Regulations, levy the Fines, and direct the Ringing.

(9) *Appeals* to lay to the MINISTER, and CHURCHWARDENS: rebellion against their decision to incur *ipso facto* deprivation of office.

*Ringings.*— (1) No *Price-Ringing, or for secular or electioneering* purposes, allowed.

(2) The *Days and Seasons* for ordinary Ringing to be such only as are prescribed.

(3) *Extraordinary occasions* (beyond Marriages) to be sanctioned by the MINISTER and one CHURCHWARDEN at the least.

(4) The *Hours of practice* to be regular, and seasonable.

(5) *Fees and Charges* to be uniform, and according to an established scale.

A more elaborate scheme has been propounded by the Rev. WALTER BLUNT, in a small Tract on "*The Use and Abuse of the Church Bells*" (p. 9—11); and another far less complicated, yet not of general applicability, by the Rev. H. T. ELLACOMBE, in a little 'brochure' entitled '*Practical Remarks on Belfries and Ringers*' (p. 19—24.); to both of which we may refer our Readers for additional suggestions.

We may here annex a practical observation or two on the subject of *Bells*, from a Paper issued by the late Cambridge Camden Society, called '*A Few Words to Churchwardens on Churches and Church Ornaments.*'—

'Never let the Bells be rung at an *Election* or any thing of that kind. The Church is in all countries what it is called in some—The House of Peace; do not make any dislike the sound of its sweet Bells, by hearing them rung because their own side is *beaten*; no, not even though they should be wrong and you right. And therefore a *flag* on a Church tower during a *contested election* is what ought never to be seen. You are told in the CANON the fit time for the Bells to be rung, viz. on *Saints'-Days* and their *Eves*. They should not be rung in *Lent* (except on Sundays); and never without the Clergyman's leave, which indeed is against law. And never allow any *Prize-ringing*. In some places they are never rung when any one rich or poor lie dead in the village, and this is a kind and good custom.' (Part I. p. 12.).—'You will see in the 88th CANON, about "Churches not to be profaned," what power the MINISTER and you have over the *Bell-Ringers*, and you are bound to support him in this matter. In some Churches the conduct of these men is shameful. Sometimes there are rival companies who think they may go into the *Belfry* whenever they wish, and who drink and smoke and quarrel there; and will for a *fee* ring the Bells on any occasion, however profane or even wicked. It may be a hard task to withstand an abuse thus sanctioned by custom, but I hope you will not shrink from doing your part in the work.' (Part II. p. 12.).

Where the *Ringers* combine to resist lawful authority, and set at nought all admonition and expostulation, such an *imperium in imperio* must not be permitted; especially when the practices of these men are of so gross and irreligious a character, as to bring not merely disgrace upon themselves, but scandal also upon the Church. Such extreme cases are happily of rare occurrence; yet when they do exist, they require to be met with energy and promptness. Possibly the Reader may expect a few hints to guide him in the event of himself being involved in so critical a position as the one we refer to. Theoretical suggestions will be of little avail, we will therefore detail a course of proceeding which has been adopted with success, and which necessity may again force into action elsewhere. The remedy chiefly lays with the *Incumbent*, and

requires, it must be confessed, a bold and resolute hand to apply it; yet in the exercise of extreme measures a calm and conciliatory spirit should not be wanting to temper the judgment and discretion which will be required. The *INCUMBENT* must in the first place be conscious of his thorough independence of the Belfry occupants: for when they are aware that arbitrary and aggressive proceedings against them are in contemplation, they will wait the opportunity to suspend their functions at a time the most critical and important. But the *Call-Bell*, and the *Funeral-Bell*, can always be commanded from the Sexton: and where it has been the practice to *Chime* the Bells\* for the Services, this can also be effected far more softly and melodiously by a little mechanical contrivance, and at a very trifling expence, so as to be accomplished by a mere boy of the Sunday-School: the method we shall presently describe. If all this can so readily be done, what need is there, it may be said, of a body of dissolute and independent *Ringers* for change-ringing,—for peals of ‘double bob majors,’ ‘union triples,’ and ‘grandeire caters?’ However, being thus fore-armed, let the *Incumbent* commence the undertaking of reform, in the first place by appealing once more to their reason and their better feelings, as well as to their sense of Christian duty: if they prove inaccessible to kind remonstrances and persuasion, recourse must then be had to the remaining alternative, which is simple but decisive; viz:—Withhold the Keys of the Church, put new locks on the Belfry-doors to provide against there being any duplicate keys abroad, substitute the mechanical mode of chiming for the ringing of changes, and thus suspend for a time the functions of the *Ringers*; and we doubt not it will be in continuance, for wherever the scheme adverted to has been adopted, it has proved not only a great source of comfort to the Incumbent, but has also given universal satisfaction to the Parishioners. The contrivance is this:—

Fasten the *Bell-Ropes* to a large staple, or piece of timber, in the centre of the Belfry-floor, and so that the Ropes do not hang loosely; place in the ceiling above through which they pass, and at any other point of friction, single block-pulleys, or reels, to prevent attrition. Then with a strong cord, (having one end attached beneath the ball of the clapper, and the other in a horizontal direction round the Bell-Rope,) bring the clapper and the Rope nearer together till the former is within 6 or 7 *in.* of the rim of the Bell: there secure them in that position by tying

---

\* To *chime* Bells is to apply just so much power to the Ropes as shall make the Bells give sound in the position in which they usually hang: to *ring* Bells is to raise them above the horizontal line, more or less, and let them fall in proper time and succession.

the cord. Thus fixed, a boy in the Belfry holding a Rope in each hand may with the greatest facility, and by a simple pull, give ample sound to the two Bells under his control; the effort he puts forth straightens the Rope, and brings the clapper forcibly against the metal. If the Ropes of several Bells are thus secured, and there is but one person to chime them: the Ropes should be gathered and tied together about 3 or 4 *ft.* from the staple in the floor, or about as high as the elbow. When thus fastened, a mere blow from the hand against each Rope in succession will produce with ease a most melodious chime.

The REV. H. T. ELLACOMBE describes another method in his little Tract, thus—'This may be effected either by heavy hammers 'to strike outside on the "*bridge*" of the Bells, like those of a 'clock; or by fixing light hammers or balls, proportioned in size, 'and in length of lever, to each Bell, and so arranged to work 'on an axis as to strike on the inside—just where the clapper 'strikes,—and when not in use, to drop down, so as to be quite 'clear of the swing of the Bell when rung. This mode is more 'simple than the outside hammers, for which there is often little 'or no room. A cord, or 'sash line' fastened at the end of the 'lever, may be guided by pulleys to a given point in the Church, 'where the ends are tied, when used, to a fixed horizontal bar. 'This bar should be about 3 *ft.* from the floor; and about 2 *ft.* 'above it there should be the last set of pulleys, arranged in a row 'about 3 *in.* apart—the pulleys should not be less than 4 *in.* 'in diameter. Care should be taken to pull the lines down, so that 'the hammer or ball may be adjusted above within a few inches of 'the Bell. With such an arrangement one person may easily do 'all the work: the lines must be untied when he has finished, 'otherwise the Bells cannot be rung if required.' (p. 11)—*Remarks on Belfries and Ringers.*

Should the course of proceeding detailed above have been accomplished, and the mechanism described been maintained in operation a sufficient time to prove to the *Bell-Ringers* that they are not indispensably necessary to give sound to the Bells, then, if it is desired, the *Ringers* upon their repentance might be restored to their occupation; but of course under new arrangements, and fresh conditions, and with a perfect willingness on their part to submit to discipline and authority. The Minister, aided by the Churchwardens, may then draw up such Rules as he may think desirable; and, eventually, there will be produced by these means a body of *Ringers* as creditable to their Parish, as they had before been an opprobrium, and a disgrace.

*Bier.*

The carriage, or wooden frame-work, on which the dead are conveyed to the grave is designated the *Bier*: the authority upon which it is provided at the cost of the Parish, is that of long established custom, derived from a constitution of *Abp. Winchelsey*, (A. D. 1294—1313.), which thus reads—

‘The Parishioners shall find at their own charge a *Bier* for the ‘Dead.’ (Lynd. 252.).—BURNS’ *Ecol. L. Phil.* I. 370; CRIPPS 418; C. G. PRIDEAUX’ *Chw. Guide*, 46; ROGERS 155; STEER’S *Par. L. Clive* 35; STEPHENS’ *L. Rel. to Cl.* 288. Also in DR. HOOK’S *Ch. Dict.* p. 86. 453.

The use of the *Bier* is too frequently superseded by the practice of carrying the Coffin on mens’ shoulders, except when the deceased person may have died of any pestilential or infectious malady; so that the *Bier* often merely serves the office of *tressels* upon which to rest the corpse while it remains in the Church. Yet the restoration of the *Bier* to its original use cannot fail to approve itself to the considerate mind, and would remove many of those objections and repulsive thoughts which occasionally arise to disturb the feelings of the Coffin-bearers: but in this case its construction must be such as to adapt it to the service for which it is designed. Some are provided with six legs so placed as to be grasped by each Bearer; while the horizontal frame-work is of sufficient width to admit of the ‘Pall’ hanging down *between* the Bearers, and the Coffin; the side beams affording also proper supports for the shoulder. Some *Biers* are of like form as to the horizontal frame-work, but the legs are moveable, or their use is supplied by tressels of about 5 feet high: others again are furnished with wheels: sometimes the frame-work is of a double character, moving upon a central spindle or pivot, when necessity shall require. The peculiar structure of the *Bier* however must depend on its ready adaptation to circumstances, and general useful-

ness; and in these points there may be great differences of opinion. The following remarks upon this subject are worthy of perusal—

‘Every consideration, sanitary and moral, cries out against the present system of carrying the Coffins on the shoulders. In every case it is prejudicial to the Bearers: in some it is absolutely dangerous. It would be curious to know when this fashion came in. Even now there are very few Parishes without their *Biers*; and they are almost always a subject of inquiry in Visitation Articles. But, when we come to examine into their use, we shall find it very limited; and, in some places, confined entirely to such as died of infectious diseases. Hence the jolting, staggering lugging,—the exclamations, “Hold hard!” “Look out!” “Take care!” which are almost inseparably connected with the shoulder system. For the Coffin has first to be hoisted, then put down on the *Tressels*, then the Bearers have to emerge from the Pall, then the Pall has to be re-arranged: then after the ‘Lesson,’ the Pall must be thrown back, the Coffin re-hoisted, the Pall arranged for the third time, and last of all, the whole process must be repeated at the grave. Now, contrast this with the *Bier*. The Coffin is simply lifted on to it; the hearse\* put over it; the Pall spread over that; thus without any one re-arrangement it is brought into the Church, then out of it into the Churchyard: then the Pall being removed with the hearse, the ropes are run through the rings, the Coffin yet resting on the *Bier*, and the lowering into the grave is an imposing ceremony instead of a distracting bustle.’ (p. 10).—Tract on ‘*Funerals, &c.*’ by the ‘*Ecclesiological Society*’

Annexed to this passage is an extract from the *Report* of the Government Commission on *Extramural Interment*, where DR. MILROY states—“He has been repeatedly obliged to forbid the Coffin being taken into the Church, to the great offence and grief of the mourners, in consequence of the horrible effluvia, often perceptible many yards off. He has on such occasions seen the sleeves of the Bearers quite dripping with the sanies that leaked from the Coffin. How the men can stand the disgusting employment, walking, as they often have to do, for a mile or more under a Pall all the while, and this too generally in warm weather (for the occurrence is most frequent then), is indeed surprising. No wonder that they usually drink to excess after such work. He has repeatedly seen the putrid discharge from the coffin dripping down along the clothes of the Undertaker’s men who carried it, so that the whole line of the Funeral procession from the gate to the grave might be traced by the drippings on the ground! This is a monstrous evil that cannot be too quickly put a stop to.” (*ib.* p. 11.).

Of whatever kind or character the *Bier* may be, it should be kept well painted, and in decent order; and have a proper place in which it may be deposited.

---

\* The *hearse* of a *Bier* is a covering of smaller character than the Funeral carriage so called. See ‘*Instrumenta Ecclesiastica.*’ Plate 32.

*Books.*

Bible,	Register of Preachers,
Prayer Book,	Register of Banns,
Homilies,	Register of Baptisms, &c.
Book of Offices,	Parish Books, &c.

The BOOKS to be provided for the conduct of Divine Service, and at the cost of the Parish, are (1) a *Bible* of the largest volume, (2) a *Prayer-Book*, and (3) the *Books of Homilies*; as enjoined in CANON 80: thus—

‘The Churchwardens or Questmen of every Church and Chapel shall, *at the charge of the Parish*, provide the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.... And if any Parishes be yet unfurnished of the BIBLE of the largest volume, or of the *Books of HOMILIES* allowed by authority, the said Churchwardens shall within convenient time provide the same at the like *charge of the Parish*.’  
—CANON 80.

I. THE BIBLE.—What *Bible* is here meant by that of ‘*the largest volume*’ is not very clear. (GIBSON. 202; BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 370; ROGERS’ *Ec. L.* 155; STEER’S *Par. L. Clive.* 35; STEPHENS’ *L. Rel. to Cl.* 287.). CRIPPS says, ‘though it may be matter of speculation as to what was originally intended by the *largest volume*,’ the discussion would now be useless.’ (*L. Rel. to Ch. and Cl.* p. 418.). Mr. C. G. PRIDEAUX considers to be implied ‘a large *Bible* of the last translation.’ (*Chw. G.* 45.).

\*. Similar directions with respect to the *Bible* were laid down in the Injunctions of Lord Cromwell in the reign of Henry VIII; and in those of Edward VI. in 1547, and of Elizabeth in 1559: thus—‘They shall provide.... one Book of the whole *Bible* of the largest volume in English.’ (CARDWELL’S ‘*Doc. Ann.* i. 8. 43, 181.). ABP. PARKER likewise in his Visitation Articles (in 1569) inquires whether Parish Churches are provided with ‘a *Bible* of the largest volume.’ (*ib.* 320.): and ABP. WHITGIFT in a letter to the Bp. of Lincoln (in 1587) urges also ‘that every Parish be therewith supplied.’ (*ib.* II. 11.).

The usual practice is to furnish a *Bible* of the Authorized Version, the largest as to size, and type, and of the best material as to paper.\*

---

\* The *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* supplies these Books for Churches at the following Prices:—

BIBLE, folio, Oxford ed. *morocco*, £2. 15s. 0d.; *rough calf*, £1. 19s. 2d.—4to. *moroc.* £1. 11.0d.; *rough calf*, £1.  
— folio, Camb. ed. *morocco*, £3. 1s. 0d.; *rough calf*, £2. 5s. 2d.—4to. *moroc.* £2.; *rough calf*, £1. 8s.



II. The BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.—In addition to the injunctions of CANON 80, the *Book of Common Prayer* is required to be provided at the cost of the Parish by *Statute Law* ; thus—

‘Be it enacted....that the Books concerning the said Services (BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER) shall, at the *costs and charges of the Parishioners* of every Parish and Cathedral Church, be attained and gotten, &c.’—1 *Eliz. c. 2. s. 19.*

And not only in Parish Churches, and Cathedrals, but the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER is also to be provided in *Colleges*, and *Halls* ; thus—

‘Be it enacted....that a true printed copy of the said Book, intituled “The BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, &c.” shall at the *costs and charges of the Parishioners* of every Parish Church and Chapelry, Cathedral Church, College, and Hall, be attained and gotten....upon pain of forfeiture of £3. by the month, for so long time as they shall then after be unprovided thereof.’—13 & 14 *Car. II. c. 4. s. 26.*

The BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER is generally supplied, like the *Bible*, of the largest size, and type, and of the best paper.\* Other questions respecting the Prayer Book have been already disposed of. (See LITURGY, *supra*, p. 268—305).

III. THE HOMILIES.—The *two Books of Homilies*, as we have just seen, are required by CANON 80. to be provided at the cost of the Parish. The first Book was published at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. in 1546-7 ; and the other in 1563, during the reign of Elizabeth. Their object was partly to supply the deficiencies of the Clergy, who at the time of the Reformation were, generally speaking, so exceedingly illiterate as to be quite incompetent to the duty of preaching ; and partly to maintain sound doctrine, by counteracting the teaching of those who still favoured the tenets of the Church of Rome.

By the *Injunctions* of Edward VI. in 1546-7, and of Elizabeth in 1559, it was ordered—‘Because through lack of Preachers in many places of the King’s Realms and Dominions, the people continue in ignorance and blindness, all Parsons,

\* BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, Oxf. ed. *morocco*, £2.; *rough cf.* £1. 6s.

— Camb. ed. red lines, *morocco*, £2. 12s. 6d.; *rough calf*, £1. 18s. 8d.

‘Vicars, and Curates, shall read in the Churches every Sunday one of the *Homilies*, which are and shall be set forth for the same purpose by the King’s authority, in such sort as they shall be appointed to do in the Preface of the same.’—(CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* 1. 19. 47, 181, 191. 199. See also *ib.* p. 60, 83: SPARROW’S *Coll.* 68. 76.)

It is also enjoined in a RUBRIC of the Liturgy, in the XXXIX ARTICLES, and in the CANONS, that one of these *Homilies* shall be read in Churches by the Parochial Clergy when there is no *Sermon*.

In the first LITURGY the *Rubric*, which will be found in the Communion-Service after the Nicene Creed, was :—

1549.—‘*After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided.*’—KEELING 177.

In the three succeeding LITURGIES the *Rubric* ran :—

1552, 1559, 1604.—‘*After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by common authority.*’—KEELING 180, 181.

Our present *Rubric* is :—

¶ ‘*Then shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by authority.*’—(1662) Book of Com. Prayer.

In one of the XXXIX *Articles* it is declared :—

‘The *Second Book of Homilies*...doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former *Book of Homilies*, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI., and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.’—ART. XXXV.

*Unlicensed Preachers*, although forbidden to expound the Scriptures, yet are directed by the CANONS to read the *Homilies* in their Churches, thus :—

‘No person whatsoever, not examined and approved by the Bishop of the Diocese, or not licensed, as is aforesaid, for a sufficient or convenient *Preacher*, shall take upon him to expound in his own Cure, or elsewhere, any Scripture or matter of doctrine; but shall only study to read plainly and aptly (without glossing or adding) the *Homilies* already set forth, or hereafter to be published by lawful authority, for the con-

'firmation of the true faith, and for the good instruction and edification of the people.'\*—CANON 49.

Again, another CANON requires that when there is no *Sermon* preached, then must one of the *Homilies* be read :—

'Every Beneficed man not allowed to be a *Preacher*, shall procure *Sermons* to be preached in his Cure once in every month at the least, by *Preachers* lawfully licensed, if his Living, in the judgment of the Ordinary, will be able to bear it. And upon every Sunday, when there shall not be a *Sermon* preached in his Cure, he or his Curate shall read some one of the *Homilies* prescribed, or to be prescribed, by authority, to the intents aforesaid.'†—CANON 46.

DEACONS, having no *Licence to preach*, are allowed according to their Form of Ordination 'to read Holy Scriptures, and *Homilies* in the Church.'—(*Form and Manner of Making Deacons*: KEELING. 374.).

DR. NICHOLLS says—'It does not appear by any marks in antiquity, that the DEACONS had ever any right to preach in the Church by virtue of their Order. And our Church, following the primitive practice, has not allowed the DEACONS to preach by virtue of their Orders, but only by permission of the Bishop; who, if he shall find them upon examination to be of competent abilities, may afford them a *Licence* to exercise their talents in this way.'—*Com. Prayer*, in loco.

With respect to the particular authority of these *Homilies*, we may quote the opinion of ARCHDEACON SHARP, who says :—'The case of *Homilies* and *Canons* is different from that of the Articles and Rubric. They are indeed equally set forth by Authority. The one is as truly the doctrine, and the other is as truly the law of the Church. But still the regard that we are supposed to pay to them is not equally the same. For though we subscribe to the *Homilies*, yet this subscription amounts to no more than our acknowledgment, that they contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine, necessary for the times they were written in, and fitting to be publicly taught unto the people;" and not that we will maintain every particular doctrine, or argument, or assertion contained in them' (p. 13.). *On Rubr. and Canons*. Charge, A. D. 1731.—Elsewhere the same Author observes :—'The times will not now bear, as they formerly did, the use of *Homilies*, or the Ministry of an unpreaching Clergy.' (p. 163.)—*ib.* Charge, A. D. 1744.

\*The 49th CANON is derived almost word for word from the '*Book of Advertisements*' of 1564. (See SPARROW'S *Coll.* 124.)

†The latter clause of this CANON is similarly expressed in the CANONS of 1571. (See SPARROW'S *Coll.* 132; ARCHD. SHARP, *On the Rubrics and Canons.* 155.).

The learning and acquirements of the modern Clergy of the Church of England are made so patent by their preparatory studies and public Examinations, as to render any Episcopal inhibition to their preaching on the score of ignorance, intellectual deficiency, or blind superstition, quite unnecessary ; so that the reading of a *Homily* as a substitute for a Sermon is now scarcely known amongst us. The following observations of BP. TOMLINE with respect to the applicability of the *Homilies* to the present times are in a great measure confirmatory of the opinion we have just expressed. As a natural consequence, therefore, the custom of supplying the *two Books of Homilies* at the cost of the Parishioners has fallen into desuetude.

BP. TOMLINE remarks.—‘The English language has changed so much since those *Homilies* were written, that they would scarcely now be understood by a common Congregation: and therefore the reading of them publicly, as it would no longer answer any good purpose, has fallen into general disuse, with the tacit consent of the governing part of the Church. The Clergy, however, may still study them with advantage to themselves; and may with advantage to others transfer parts of them into their Sermons, with such alterations as the change of circumstances may render expedient.’—(quoted in MANT’S *Book of Common Prayer*. p. 295.).

IV. BOOK OF OFFICES.—For reading the ‘Communion Service,’ a Book must of necessity be provided, and where there is an Assistant Clergyman, two are requisite: a *Book of Offices* is also necessary for performing the *Occasional Services*. Yet there is no especial Law or CANON imposing the cost of these Books upon the Parishioners: sometimes, however, the burden is laid on them by custom: but it is more usual for the Incumbent to supply them at his own charge.\*

---

\* The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge provides these Books as follows—

BOOK FOR THE COMMUNION TABLE. Medium 4to. moroc. £1. 4s. 6d.; rough calf, 17s. 6d.; Demy 4to. moroc. £1. 2s.; rough calf, 15s.

BOOK OF OFFICES. 8vo. morocco, 6s. 6d.; rough cf. 3s. 9d.

V. **THE CLERK'S BOOKS.**—A large *Bible*, and *Prayer-Book*, for the **CLERK'S Desk** are usually supplied by the Churchwardens out of the Parish funds; but not of necessity. Should they refuse, the **CLERK** must find his own Books. In this, however, he is most likely to be assisted by the Incumbent.

With respect to the condition and repair of the Books used by the Officiating Minister for conducting Divine Worship, there is an ancient Constitution enjoining the Archdeacons to see that they are fit, and in good order; thus;—

'The Archdeacons shall take care that the Clothes of the Altar be decent and in good order, that the Church have *fit Books*, both *for Singing and Reading*, and at least two sacerdotal Vestments.' (REYNOLDS, Synod. 52).—BURN'S *Ec. L. Phil.* i. 367 *e.*

\* \* It is very important that these Books be kept free from mutilation, and from mildew or other stains, that may obscure their legibility. They should also be supplied with *ribbons or markers* of different widths and colours to indicate the place of the Lessons, Psalms, Collects, and other parts of the Services; which will prevent the turning down of the leaves: a practice commonly resorted to, but very detrimental to the condition and appearance of the Books. When a *leaf* is accidentally torn, it ought to be immediately secured and mended; and any injury to the *binding* should be at once repaired: this duty will devolve upon the Churchwardens.

VI. **REGISTER of Strange Preachers.** — The Churchwardens are required by the 52nd. CANON (of 1603-4) to cause to be entered in a *Book* provided for the purpose at the charge of the Parish the Names, and certain other particulars, of all *Strangers who preach* in their Churches: thus—

'That the Bishop may understand (if occasion so require) what Sermons are made in every Church of his Diocese, and who presume to preach without Licence. The Churchwardens and Sidesmen shall see that the *Names* of all PREACHERS which come to the Church from any other place be noted in a *Book*, which they shall have ready for that purpose; wherein every PREACHER shall subscribe his *Name*, the *day* when he preached, and the name of the *Bishop* of whom he had Licence to preach.'\*—CANON 52.

\* This Canon is identical with one of the Canons of 1571. (See SPARROW'S *Coll.* 237.)

Literal and strict conformity to the injunctions of this CANON in the present age appears to be impossible, from the fact that the Clergy of the Church of England have not now any separate and distinct '*Licence to Preach*' delivered to them. *Lecturers*, perhaps, may be an exception: but even here the *Licence* restricts the function to a particular Church or Chapel, in the same manner as the authority to Preach, incorporated occasionally into a *Curate's Licence*, confines the liberty of preaching to the place to which the CURATE is appointed. It is erroneously thought by many that the '*Letters of Orders*' are equivalent to a LICENCE TO PREACH: by others, that *Orders* together with Institution or Collation to a Benefice, or with a *Licence to a Cure of souls*, involve a general commission to preach, and are tantamount to a Preaching Licence. A reliance upon either of these interpretations might, in certain cases, bring a Clergyman into difficulty, especially if it should tempt him to resist any Episcopal inhibition.

ARCHDEACON SHARP, referring to this argument, says—'If this reasoning be good, it may be extended still further, even to the justifying our preaching, not only out of our own Cures, but in another Diocese, or in another Province, without any permission from the Ecclesiastical superiors thereof. . . . And accordingly we find, that, in those places where a *Book is kept for registering* the names of '*Strange Preachers*,' it is thought sufficient to satisfy the CANON, for the Stranger to set down the Bishop's name who *ordained* him in lieu of that Bishop's name who gave him *licence to preach*, as the CANON enjoins. But now, how easy and plausible soever this solution of the matter may appear, I fear it does not stand upon a good bottom. I fear even beneficed men will not be allowed to plead it for preaching within their own cures, much less for doing so out of their Parishes. The reasons are, because no powers are conferred in Ordination, or in Collations, Institutions, or any other admissions to Cures, but what are subject and liable to be controlled and limited by Ecclesiastical authority. . . . These CANONS are standing laws of restraint upon us the inferior Clergy, and are neither rendered obsolete, nor weakened by being now 140 years old. For, to put it out of question that they are yet in force, the Bishops, by virtue of them, not only may, but actually do, when they think proper, compel the Clergy within their jurisdictions to take out *Preaching Licences* in form: or upon their refusal to do so, absolutely prohibit their making any further use of their own Pulpits, than for the reading of *Homilies* themselves, or substituting some licenced Preachers in their place. Therefore. I apprehend, our defence and

'apology for our present usages and practice must stand upon some other foundation than the right and privileges of *Ordination*, and *Institution*. And, I conceive, it can rest only here, viz. upon a general *tacit dispensation* of all, or most, of the Ordinaries in the kingdom, with one accord, and, as it were, with one voice agreeing (a particular case, perhaps, or two excepted) to a relaxation, or rather a temporary suspension, of all those Canon laws about *Licences for Preaching*. (p. 160 — 162)....As for our doing it out of our *Parishes*, or wherever we have an occasional call, though it be less agreeable to the ancient rules of our Church than the case last mentioned, yet it stands upon as good a footing of a presumptive consent of all the Bishops within the realm, as the other doth. It is a convenience, as a relief, to the Clergy in general; and as no inconvenience hath hitherto arisen from it; so, if there should, the Ordinaries within their respective jurisdictions have still the remedy in their own hands. Which circumstance alone, had we no other reason to support it, would justify our interpreting their connivance as a plenary permission, if not rather an approbation of what we do. We do not therefore usurp this power, we do not claim it as of right, but we use it as an indulgence or a favour of our superiors.' (p. 165.)—*On Rubrics and Canons*. Cbargé A.D. 1744.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—'The reasons for the great strictness formerly enjoined having ceased, the directions of the various CANONS in this respect\* are no longer acted upon; the inquiries made by the Churchwardens of *Strange Preachers*, and the entries by them in *Books* for that purpose, have generally long since fallen into disuse, although such *Books* are still to be found kept in some Churches.' (p. 602.)—*Laws Rel. to Ch. & Clergy*.

In further elucidation of this question we may direct attention to another CANON bearing upon the same point, the 50th CANON, thus:—

'Neither the Minister, Churchwardens, nor any other Officers of the Church shall suffer any man to *preach* within their Churches or Chapels, but such as by shewing their *Licence to preach*, shall appear unto them to be sufficiently authorized thereunto, as is aforesaid.'—CANON 50.

Here a *Strange Preacher* is required to shew his *Licence to preach* before he can be allowed to deliver his sermon.

The BISHOP OF LONDON (*Dr. Blomfield*) requires the *Letters of Orders*, and *Testimonials* also, of a Stranger to be exhibited to him before he may officiate. He gives direction to his Clergy—'That you will not permit any Clergyman to officiate as your temporary substitute, or assistant, not being a personal friend or

---

\* The CANONS which refer to *Preachers*, and *Preaching*, are CANONS 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54.

'acquaintance of your own, who shall not have first exhibited to me his *Letters of Orders*, and *Testimonials*.' (p. 66.)—*Charge* 1842.

DR. HOOK considers the *Licence to preach* spoken of in the 50th CANON to be represented by the '*Letters of Orders*;' for he observes—'Churchwardens have the power to demand a sight of the *Letters of Orders* of any one offering to assist in the Church of which they are the Guardians.'—*Ch. Dict.* ART. 'LETTERS OF ORDERS.'

MR. CRIPPS says—'Formerly a Churchwarden has actually been committed to gaol by Justices of the Peace for permitting one who was a *stranger* to preach in his Church without having first demanded to see his *Licence*, although in fact the Preacher was duly licensed; and the commitment was held good.' (p. 602.)—*Laws Rel. to Ch. & Clergy*.

We will now adduce a few decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts; for which however we must go back to the preceding generation.

LORD HARDWICKE decided in the case of *Trice v. Keith* A. D. 1742.—'As to *Preaching*, there is no pretence for doing it without Licence from the Bishop, for the CANONS of 1603, confirmed by 'Act of Parliament', are express as to that matter. It is not necessary, indeed, for a Minister to have a Licence from the Bishop of the Diocese for every particular case; but the Bishop may suspend him wholly if he is irregular.' (2 Atk. 498.)

In *Brown v. Spence* it was declared, that—'An allowance by the Bishop of any Diocese has been held sufficient, although his allowance be only to *preach* within *his* Diocese; for the Statute, it is said, does not require any allowance by the Bishop of the Diocese where the Church is.' (1 Kehle 503). WATSON says on this case—'I take it a *Preacher* by the CANON is obliged to procure a Licence from the Bishop where the Church is, notwithstanding any Licence obtained from another Bishop; and this is agreeable to the words used in the Form of ordaining Priests, which are—'Take thou authority to *preach* &c. in the Congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.'" (C. L.)—(quoted in CRIPP'S *L. Rel. to Ch. & Cl.* p. 603.)

SIR JOHN NICHOLL, in *Gates v. Chambers*—where the latter was charged with officiating as Curate without a licence—argued: 'He only came to officiate *for the Rector* on a particular occasion. That occasional assistance so given is punishable as an Ecclesiastical offence, merely because the Minister, so assistant, has not been licensed as *Curate* by the Bishop of the Diocese, is more than, without further consideration and other authorities being adduced, I am prepared to lay down as the rule of law: such a rule would be highly inconvenient to the Clergy, and might not unfrequently occasion Parishioners to be deprived altogether of the Church Service. This interpretation of the 48th CANON is confirmed,

---

\* Not by any specific Act. See page 289.



‘in my judgment, by the 50th, and 52nd CANONS (see *above*), ‘which are in *pari materia*.’—(After quoting the 50th CANON to show that no Stranger is to preach without first exhibiting his *Licence to preach*, he adds).—‘Now the 52nd CANON plainly ‘implies that this ‘*Licence to preach*,’ at least, was not required to ‘be had of the *local Ordinary*; for the entry directed to be made, ‘by that CANON, for the purpose of conveying information to the ‘*local Ordinary* in the case of a *Stranger* preaching in his Diocese, ‘is, among other things, to set forth the name of the Bishop by ‘whom his *Licence to preach* was granted. It appears, indeed, from ‘the 49th CANON (see page 512) that the *licence to preach* referred to ‘in these, the 50th, and 52nd CANONS, was quite a distinct thing from ‘the ‘*Licence to a Cure*,’ which is the subject of the 48th CANON— ‘being (the first) a licence to ‘*preach*’ specially, without which ‘Ministers were forbidden by the 49th CANON, “to *expound*,” as ‘it is termed (i. e. to *preach*), “in their own *Cure*, or elsewhere,” ‘or to do any more than “read plainly and aptly, without glossing ‘or adding, the *Homilies* (then) already set forth or in future to be ‘published &c.” It is well known that such (separate *Licences to ‘preach*) were in use both before, and for some time after the ‘Reformation: but, for the last century or two, in consequence of ‘the Clergy being better educated, or for some other reason, ‘they have fallen into desuetude; and are now *included* either in ‘“*Letters of Orders*,” or in the *Licences* of Ministers to particular ‘*Cures*.’ (2 Ad. 189).

From these arguments, opinions, and juridical decisions, it has been taken for granted, that the usage, prescribed in CANON 52, of entering the Names &c. of *Strange Preachers* in a *Book* provided by the Parish, is obsolete; and such *Register-Book*, therefore, superfluous.

\* \* With respect to *Foreign Clergy* officiating in our Churches, See *supra* under “THE LEGAL ENACTMENTS *Affecting the Stipendiary Curate*.”

VII. REGISTER of BANNS of Marriage,—A *Book* in which the *Banns of Marriage* are to be entered, and out of which they are to be published, is required by the Statute (4 Geo. IV. c. 76.) to be provided by the Churchwardens at the cost of the Parish. Publishing ‘BANNS’ from *loose papers* is distinctly prohibited by this enactment.

‘Be it enacted, that on or before the said 1st day of November, ‘and from time to time afterwards as there shall be occasion, ‘the Churchwardens and Chapelwardens of Churches and Chapels ‘wherein MARRIAGES are solemnized shall provide a *proper Book* ‘of substantial paper, marked and ruled respectively in manner ‘directed for the Register Book of Marriages; and the BANNS

'shall be published from the said Register Book of Banns by the Officiating Minister, and not from loose papers, and after publication shall be signed by the Officiating Minister, or by some person under his direction.'—4 Geo. IV. c. 76. s. 6. (A. D. 1823.).

VIII. REGISTERS of BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES, and BURIALS.—These Books are required both by the CANON, and by the *Statute Law*, to be provided at the charge of the Parish. The provisions of the CANON, however, have in a great measure been superseded by more recent enactments, which have imposed a system of *Civil Registration*. The 70th CANON enjoins :—

'In every Parish Church and Chapel within this Realm, shall be provided one *parchment Book* at the charge of the Parish, wherein shall be written the Day and Year of every CHRISTENING, WEDDING, and BURIAL. . . And for the safe keeping of the said Book, the Churchwardens, at the Charge of the Parish, shall provide one sure *Coffer*, with three Locks and Keys ; whereof the one to remain with the Minister, and the other two with the Churchwardens severally ; so that neither the Minister without the two Churchwardens, nor the Churchwardens without the Minister, shall at any time take that Book out of the said *Coffer*. And henceforth upon every Sabbath-Day, immediately after Morning or Evening Prayer, the Minister and Churchwardens shall take the said *parchment Book* out of the said *Coffer*, and the Minister, in the presence of the Churchwardens, shall write and record in the said Book the Names of all persons *Christened*, together with the Names and Surnames of their Parents, and also the Names of all persons *Married*, and *Buried*, in that Parish in the Week before, and the Day and Year of every such Christening, Marriage, and Burial ; and that done, they shall lay up that Book in the *Coffer*, as before, and the Minister and Churchwardens unto every page of that Book, when it shall be filled with such inscriptions, shall subscribe their Names. And the Churchwardens shall, once every year, within one month after the 25th day of March, transmit unto the Bishop of the Diocese, or his Chancellor, a true copy of the Names of all persons Christened, Married, or Buried in their Parish in the year before, ended the said 25th day of March, and the certain days and months in which every such Christening, Marriage and Burial was had, to be subscribed with the hands of the said Minister, and Churchwardens, to the end the same may faithfully be preserved in the Registry of the said Bishop ; which Certificate shall be received without fee. And if the Minister or Churchwardens shall be negligent in performance of any thing herein contained, it shall be lawful for the Bishop or his Chancellor to convent them, and proceed against every of them as contemners of this our Constitution.'—CANON 70.

\* \* \* The practice of keeping *Parish Registers* of BAPTISMS,

The *Statute Laws* bearing upon the subject of PARISH REGISTERS\* are the following—

52 *Geo. III. c. 146. A. D. 1812. (Registers)*  
 11 *Geo. IV. & 1 Will. IV. c. 66. A. D. 1830. (Forgery)*  
 6 & 7 *Will. IV. c. 85. A. D. 1836. (Marriages)*  
 — c. 86. — (Registration)  
 7 *Will. IV. & 1 Vict. c. 22. A. D. 1837. (Registration)*  
 3 & 4 *Vict. c. 72. A. D. 1840. (Marriages)*  
 — c. 92 — (Non-Parochial Registers)

Public and private *Baptisms*, Marriages, and *Burials*, within all Parishes or Chapelries in England, whether subject to the Ordinary, or peculiar, or other jurisdiction, shall be made and kept by the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister of every Parish (or of any Chapelry where the Ceremonies of Baptism, Marriage, and Burial, have been usually and may according to law be performed) for the time being in *Books of parchment*, or of good and durable *paper*, to be provided by His Majesty's Printer as occasion may require at the expence of the respective Parishes or Chapelries.' (Sect. 1).— 'Other *Books* of like form and quality shall for the like purposes be furnished from time to time by the Churchwardens or Chapelwardens of every Parish or Chapelry, at the expence of the said Parish or Chapelry whenever they shall be required by the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister to provide the same; and all such *Books* shall be of *paper*, unless required to be of *parchment* by such Churchwardens or Chapelwardens respectively.' (Sect. 2).— 'Such *Registers* shall be kept in such *separate Books* aforesaid.' (Sect. 3).—52 Geo. III. c. 146.

\* The old Statutes, 30 *Car.* II. c. 3; and 32 *Car.* II. c. 1. for 'Burying in Woollen' were repealed by 54 *Geo.* III. c. 108. And 6 & 7 *Will.* III. c. 6; 9 & 10 *Will.* III. c. 35. s. 4; imposing a tax on Registration; and the Act 26 *Geo.* II. c. 33. against 'Clandestine Marriages,' were repealed by 52 *Geo.* III. c. 146.

The provision respecting *Marriages* has been repealed by the following enactment:—

As to MARRIAGES,—‘The *Registrar General* shall cause to be printed on account of the said Register Office a sufficient number of *Register Books* for making entries of all Births, Deaths, and *Marriages* of His Majesty’s subjects in England, according to the forms . . . to this Act annexed; and the said Register Books shall be of durable materials.’ (Sect. 17).—‘The *Registrar General* shall furnish or cause to be furnished to the Rector, Vicar, or Curate, of every Church and Chapel in England wherein *Marriages* may lawfully be solemnized . . . a sufficient number in Duplicate of *Marriage Register-Books*, and *Forms*, for certified Copies thereof, as hereinafter provided; and the cost of all such *Books*, and *Forms*, shall be paid by the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Parish or Chapelry out of the monies in their hands as such Churchwardens and Overseers, or by the Registering Officer or Secretary respectively to whom the same shall be furnished.’ (Sect. 30).—6 & 7. Will IV. c. 86.

The *Books* necessary for keeping these *Registers* are to be provided, as we see by the above Statutes, at the cost of the Parish; those for *Baptisms* and *Burials* from the Queen’s Printer, out of the Church-Rate; and those for *Marriages* from the Office of the Registrar General, out of the Poor-Rate.

The *Custody of the Books*.—The Register Books are to be kept in an *iron chest*, which is to be deposited in the *House* of the officiating Minister, or in the *Church*; and the *Key* be in his custody.—

‘The *Register Books* shall be deemed to belong to every such Parish or Chapelry respectively, and shall be kept by, and remain in the power and custody of the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or other Officiating Minister of each respective Parish or Chapelry as aforesaid, and shall be by him safely and securely kept in a dry, well painted *iron chest*, to be provided, and repaired, as occasion may require, at the expence of the Parish or Chapelry, and which said *Chest* containing the said Books shall be constantly kept locked in some dry, safe, and secure place within the usual place of residence of such Rector, Vicar, Curate, or other Officiating Minister (if resident within the Parish or Chapelry), or in the Parish *Church* or *Chapel*: and the said Books shall not, nor shall any of them be taken or removed from or out of the said *Chest*, at any time or for any cause whatever, except for the purpose of making such entries therein as aforesaid, or for the inspection of persons desirous to make search therein, or to obtain Copies from or out of the same, or to be produced as evidence in some Court of Law or Equity, or to be inspected as to the state and condition thereof, or for some of the purposes of this Act: and that immediately after making such respective entries, or producing the said Books res-

‘pectively for the purposes aforesaid, the said Books shall forth-  
 ‘with again be safely and securely deposited in the said Chest.’—  
 52 *Geo.* III. c. 146. s. 5.

\*. This Enactment supersedes the clause in CANON 70, requiring the Ministers and Churchwardens to have the *joint* custody of these *Registers*. And the later Statute, 6 & 7 *Will* IV. c. 86, does not interfere in this respect with 52 *Geo.* III. c. 146: nor at all indeed with the Parish Registers of *Baptisms*, and *Burials*; only with the Register of *Marriages*.

It is to be recommended that in conveying these Register Books to and from the Church as occasion may require, they should not be open to the eye of the curious, nor accessible to the fraudulent to be tampered with; or their admissibility as evidence in a Court of Law will be questionable. They ought therefore to be deposited in a light portable *Box*, or in a *Bag*, under lock and key, so as never to be out of the custody of the Minister.

To avoid repetition the Reader is referred for other particulars concerning *Registers*, and *Registration*, to the ‘LEGAL ENACTMENTS Affecting the Stipendiary Curate’ (*supra*); and to the Baptismal, Burial, and Marriage Services, *postea*.

IX. CHURCHWARDENS’ BOOKS.—*Churchwardens* are required to find at the Parish charge in addition to the Books necessary for making and collecting *Church-Rates*,—

- (a) A *Minute Book*, called the ‘*Churchwardens’ Book*’, in which to enter every proceeding connected with their office: and which should contain a list of the Church Goods, &c.
- (b) An *Account Book* in which to set down all Receipts, and Disbursements.

On quitting Office, CHURCHWARDENS and Overseers are to transmit to their Successors their *Books of Accounts*; and every person assessed, or liable to be assessed, may inspect them at all reasonable times (by 17 *Geo.* II. c. 38. s. 14): but Churchwardens cannot maintain an action of trover against their predecessors in Office for these Books. (*Addison v. Round*, 4 A & E. 799.)

MR. J. N. SPELLEN (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—‘By CANON 87, ‘a *Book* for the Churchwarden’s Accounts, a note of all the Glebe lands and other possessions belonging to the Church, and a Chest,

'with Lock and Keys, to keep them in, are also to be provided'. (p. 19)—*Vestry Clerk & Par. Lawyer*.

X. VESTRY BOOKS.—A *Minute Book*, in which the proceedings of all Vestry Meetings are to be entered, must be provided at the cost of the Parish, as laid down in the Statute: thus—

'*Minutes* of the proceedings and resolutions of every Vestry 'are to be fairly and distinctly entered in a *Book* (to be provided 'for that purpose by the Churchwardens and Overseers of the 'Poor), and be signed by the Chairman and by such other of the 'inhabitants present as may think proper to sign the same'—58 *Geo. III. c. 69. s. 2*.

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) says—'The *Vestry-Book* is to be provided by the Churchwardens and Overseers of the 'Poor out of the Poor-Rate, and not by the Churchwardens out of 'the Church Rate...but, of course, this only applies to the Vestry 'of a Parish. Where the Vestry is constituted for *Ecclesiastical* 'purposes only, as under the Church-Building Acts, the Book 'must be provided by the Churchwardens.' (p. 47. n)—*Churchwarden's Guide*.

The *Custody of the Parish Books and Papers* is imposed on the person appointed by the Vestry: as laid down by the 'Vestries Act,' thus—'Be it enacted that as 'well the *Books* hereby directed to be provided and kept for the 'entry of the proceedings of *Vestries* (in *Sec. 2*. quoted above) as 'all former Vestry Books, and all Rates and Assessments, 'Accounts and Vouchers of the Churchwardens, Overseers of the 'Poor, and Surveyors of the High-ways, and other Parish Officers, 'and all certificates, orders of Courts and of Justices, and other 'Parish Books, Documents, Writings, and public papers of every 'Parish, *except the Registry of Marriages, Baptisms, and* 'Burials, shall be kept by such person or persons, and deposited 'in such place and manner, as the inhabitants in Vestry assembled 'shall direct.'—58 *Geo. III. c. 69. s. 6*.

*Injuring, or With-holding the Parish Books*, exposes the party so offending to a penalty not exceeding £50, nor less than 40s.: thus—'If any person in whose hands or custody any such 'Book, Rate, Assessment, Account, Voucher, Certificate, Order, 'Document, Writing, or Paper shall be, shall wilfully or negligent- 'ly destroy, obliterate, or injure the same, or suffer the same to 'be destroyed, obliterated, or injured, or shall, after reasonable 'notice or demand, refuse or neglect to deliver the same in such 'place as shall by the order of any such Vestry be directed, every 'person so offending, and being lawfully convicted thereof, on his 'own confession, or on the oath of one or more credible witness or 'witnesses, by and before two of His Majesty's Justices of the 'Peace, upon complaint thereof to them made, shall for every such 'offence forfeit and pay such sum, not exceeding £50, nor less 'than 40s. as shall by such Justices be adjudged and determined.'

...to be levied as arrears of Poor-rates are, and applied to the relief of the Poor... and proceedings may be taken in any of His Majesty's Courts, civilly or criminally.—(*ib*).

Under the *Special Vestries Act*, *Minute Books* are also required to be provided at the cost of the Parish: thus—

'The *Vestry* of every Parish adopting this Act shall cause to be provided and kept a proper *Book* or *Books*, and proper entries to be made therein of the names of the several Vestrymen who shall attend the respective Meetings of the Vestry, and of all orders and proceedings made and taken at such Meetings; and all such Books shall at all reasonable times be open to the inspection of the said Vestrymen, and of any other person rated or assessed to the Relief of the Poor of the said Parish, and of any Creditor on the Rates of the said Parish, without fee or reward; and the said Vestrymen, persons, and creditors, or any of them, shall and may take copies of, or extracts from, such Books respectively, without paying anything for the same; and in case the *Clerk* to the said Vestry, or other person having the care of such Books, shall refuse... he shall forfeit and pay any sum of money not exceeding £10 for every such offence.'—1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 60. s. 31.—The next *Section* (§ 32) provides that a *Book of Accounts* shall be kept, and be open to the inspection of any person rated to the Relief of the Poor; and that extracts may be taken from the said Book free of charge: refusal incurs a penalty not exceeding £10.—By *Section* 35, the Auditors may demand an inspection of the Books of Accounts and of other Books and Documents connected therewith: refusal is a misdemeanor.

\*.\* A *Vestry Clerk* can be compelled to produce these Books and Papers when demanded for Parish purposes, or for advancing any Parochial right, but not if they are required for personal objects. The Court refused to compel a Vestry Clerk to produce documents from the Parish Chest in the case of *May v. Gwynne*, where the object was to furnish evidence against the Vestry Clerk in an action of libel brought against him by a Parishioner. (4 B. & A. 301). Yet a *Vestry Clerk*, who is called as a witness, cannot on the ground that it may criminate himself, object to produce the Vestry-Book, kept under the Statute, 58 Geo. III. c. 69. s. 2. (FRY'S *Stat. Rel. to Parishes*. p. 13. n;) But if the *Parish Books* are in the custody of any other person, the Vestry Clerk may have a mandamus to compel the delivery of them to to him. (*Rec v. Croydon (Chv. of)* 5 T. R. 713). In another case however where the application was against a Churchwarden, LORD ELLENBOROUGH decided—'If the muniments belong to the *Vestry Clerk* as annexed to his office, he may bring an action of detinue or trover;' and his Lordship refused the rule. (*Anon.* 2 Chitt. 255).—STEPHENS' *L. Rel. to Cl.* 1334.

*Candlesticks* &c. See '*Lights*' infra.

*Clocks, and Chimes.*

I. CLOCKS, although highly useful and important, whether in the Tower of the Church for the benefit of the Parishioners generally, or in the interior of the Church for the convenience of the Officiating Minister, are not required by any CANON, or *Statute Law*, to be provided of necessity by the Churchwardens. Yet if a *Clock* has existed from time immemorial, the Parish is bound to keep it in order; or if the majority in a Vestry Meeting determine on setting up a *Clock*, and it has the consent of the Ordinary, the Parishioners are chargeable with its repair and preservation. The *Clock* within the Church is very frequently the gift of the Incumbent, who generally holds himself responsible for the expences attending it. Occasionally, the original outlay, and all subsequent charges are met by some *Church-fund*, or paid out of *Pew-rents*, where these are imposed.

*Clocks* in the Church Tower appear to have quite supplanted the old *Sun-Dial*; yet these, where they may be found, should not be suffered to go to decay. And, again, the *Clocks* within the Church have superseded the ancient *Hour-Glass*; indeed, the iron frame work which used to support it, is still to be seen in some few of our Churches.

DR. HOOK writes with respect to the *Hour-glass*—‘*Hour-glass*, with long Sermons, a relic of puritanical times. It was till lately, occasionally seen fastened to the Pulpit.’—*Ch. Dict.* Art. ‘*HOURL-GLASS.*’

II. CHIMES, which are an occasional accompaniment to *Church Clocks*, are not necessarily to be provided, nor kept in repair by the Churchwardens, except immemorial custom has imposed the burden on the Church-Rate, or some other Parish fund; yet with the consent of the majority of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled they may be set up, and maintained. The requisite machinery to connect



the Clock with the Bells in order to produce a set of *Chimes* is often supplied at the cost of a private individual, who will sometimes bequeath a sufficient sum to secure its preservation and repair. But he must first obtain the consent of the Ordinary, and the Incumbent, to the introduction of such *Chimes*; and the Incumbent should be very careful to determine the selection of *Tunes*.

Most Law authorities have decided with respect to *Clocks*, and *Chimes*, and other non-essential things of the like kind connected with the Church, that no provision is made for them by any special Law, and they must therefore be referred to the general power of the *Churchwardens*, with the consent of the major part of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled, and under the direction of the Ordinary. (See page 487. and BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 374; CRIPPS. 419; STEER'S *Par. L. Clivc.* 37; STEPHEN'S *L. Rel. to. Cl.* 292.).

\*.\* The recent decision of the HOUSE OF LORDS, (August 12, 1853) in the celebrated '*Braintree case*' seems likely however, to throw this matter, and indeed all others dependent on the Church-Rate, upon the '*voluntary system*' for the supply of the requisite funds, until some fresh legislation shall determine the liability.

### *Communion-Table, & its Furniture.*

A *Communion Table* is directed by the 82nd CANON to be set up in Churches at the cost of the Parish; but, of what form and material it should be constructed, the CANON does not express. It merely requires that it shall be '*convenient and decent*'; its costliness and character, therefore, are dependent upon the liberality of the Parishioners, and upon the taste the Churchwardens may possess in such matters, unless indeed these will defer to the judgment of the Incumbent. The CANON runs—

'Whereas we have no doubt but that in all Churches within the Realm of England *convenient and decent Tables* are provided and placed for the celebration of the Holy Communion, we

‘appoint, that the same Tables shall from time to time be kept  
 ‘and repaired in sufficient and seemly manner....to be done at  
 ‘the charge of the Parish.’—CANON 82.

The RUBRICS of the ‘Office for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper’ repeatedly refer to the *Communion-Table*; and their requirements, which are binding in law, render it imperatively necessary that a *Table* should be provided in order to the due solemnization of the Holy Communion. In the Liturgy it is designated, sometimes the ‘*Lord’s Table*’; sometimes simply ‘*The Table*’; while in the first Exhortation of the Communion-Office it is styled the ‘*Holy Table*.’ It is consequently acknowledged by, perhaps, the greater number of the Clergy, that Canonically, Rubrically, and therefore *legally*, the correct designation of this Ornament of the Church is ‘*The Communion Table*.’ Yet there are many who contend, that as the Rubric of our present Prayer Book directs us to the *first* LITURGY of Edward VI, for the ‘Ornaments of the Church,’ where this ‘Table’ is called ‘*The Altar*,’ therefore the latter is the proper appellation. It may be well perhaps to examine this question a little further, since it has assumed in modern days somewhat of a controversial aspect: and this will require us to discuss the subject of the *Communion-Table* under a three-fold point of view; viz.—(1) its *Appellation*; (2) its *Material*; and (3) its *Place*.

I. Its *Appellation*.—In the *first* LITURGY of Edward VI (1549), as well as before the Reformation, we find that the Holy Communion was styled ‘The Mass,’ and the word ‘*Altar*’ usually applied to what we now call the Communion-Table: yet in this very Liturgy the expressions ‘*The Lord’s Table*,’ ‘*God’s Board*’ were adopted in certain of the Rubrics of this particular Office. (KEELING 167. 213; CLAY 100. c. 117. i.) As the Reformation advanced, however, a complete change of terms was effected by the voice of public authority.

In 1550. BP. RIDLEY issued injunctions to his Clergy, directing, among other things—‘Whereas in divers places ‘some use the Lord’s Board after the form of a *Table*, ‘and some as an *Altar*, whereby dissention is perceived to ‘arise among the unlearned: therefore wishing a godly unity to

'be observed in all our Diocese; and for that the form of a *Table* 'may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious 'opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, we exhort the Curates, Churchwardens, and Questmen, here 'present to erect and set up the Lord's Board after the form of an 'honest *Table*.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 82.). This was confirmed by an order from the Council sent to BP. RIDLEY in the same year commanding him to see that all *Altars* were taken down in his diocese, and that *Communion-Tables* were placed in their stead. (HEYLYN'S *Hist. of the Ref.* E. H. S. i. 202-5; CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 89). To the other Bishops also circular Letters were directed to the same effect, in order to remove 'the people from the 'superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and because *Table* 'was a more proper name than *Altar* for that on which the 'Sacrament was laid.'—(BURNET'S *Hist. of the Ref.* Nares' Ed. ii. 254). But 'no universal change,' says HEYLYN, 'of *Altars* into 'Tables (took place) in all parts of the Realm, till the repealing of 'the first *Liturgy*,—in which the Priest is appointed "to stand "before the midst of the *Altar*" in the celebration,—and the establishing of the *second*,—in which it is required that the Priest shall 'stand on the north side of the *Table*,"—had put an end to the dispute.'—(*Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. i. 205).

In 1552. appeared the *Second LITURGY* of Edward VI. in which the Communion Office was described as 'The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion,' and the word '*Table*,' was substituted for '*Altar*:' and thus it remained in all the subsequent Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer.—(KEELING in loco.)

In 1559. *Elizabeth* in her Injunctions ordered, 'That the '*Holy Table* in every Church be decently made, and set in the 'place where the *Altar* stood.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 201).

In 1564. In the '*Book of Advertisements*' it is directed—'That 'the Parishes provide a decente *Table* standinge on a frame for the '*Communion-Table*.'—(*ib.* 292.)

In 1569. ABP. PARKER inquires of his Clergy—'Whether you 'have.... a comly and decent *Table* for the Holy Communion, 'covered decently, and set in the place prescribed by the Queene's 'Majesty's Injunctions?'—(*ib.* 320.).

In 1571. GRINDALL, *Abp. of York*, enjoined that,—'All *Altars* 'were to be pulled to the ground, and the *Altar-stones* defaced, and 'bestowed to some common use; the Prayers and other service 'appointed for the Administration of the Holy Communion to be 'done at the *Communion-Table*.'—(quoted by SIR HERBERT JENNER FUST in re *Faulkner v. Litchfield & Stearne*. 1 Rob. 185.)

In 1576. GRINDALL, then ABP. OF CANTERBURY, inquires—'Whether in your Churches and Chapels all *Altars* be utterly 'taken down and clean removed even unto the foundation, and 'the place where they stood paved, and the wall whereunto 'they joined painted over and made uniform with the rest'—(*ib.*).

In 1603-4, appeared the Code of CANONS by which we are now bound, where the word *Table* is maintained; as seen above.

In 1640, however, the *Canons* of LAUD sanctioned the application of the term '*Altar*' to the Communion-Table: thus—'We declare that this situation of the *holy Table*, doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a true and proper *Altar*, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is, and may be called an *Altar by us* in that sense in which the primitive Church called it 'an *Altar*, and in no other.'—(more fully quoted in p. 295. *supra*; where also the *authority* of these CANONS has been discussed in *extenso*.)

In 1662, appeared the *last Review* of the LITURGY, where the adoption of the word '*Table*' is confirmed; and it is by the RUBRICS of this Book that we are now bound.

But let us proceed to quote a few *Ecclesiastical* opinions.—

BP. OVERALL's *Chaplain* (cir. 1614—19) says—'The word *Table* here stands not exclusively, as if it might not be called an *Altar*, but to shew the indifferency and liberty of the name; as of old it was called '*Mensa Domini*;' the one having reference to the participation, the other to the oblation of the Eucharist. There are who contend now, it was the intent and purpose of our Church at this Reformation, to pull down and wholly extinguish the very name of an *Altar*; hut all their reason being only the matter of fact, that *Altars* were then pulled down, and this place of the Liturgy, that here it is called a *Table*: we answer that the matter of fact proves nothing, being rather the zeal of the people, that were newly come out of the tyranny that was used in Queen Mary's time. . . . They that will not either endure we should have, or they who will not helieve we have, any *Altar* allowed and continued in our Church (howsoever as it is here, and as it is in most of the Fathers, sometimes called a *Table*), let them go to the King's Court, and to most of our Cathedral Churches, and inquire how long they have stood there, and kept that name only, as heing indeed the most eminent and the most usual among the Christians.'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S C. Pr.* p. 37.

HEYLYN (*ob.* 1662) in the Preface to his *Cyprianus Anglicus* ('Life of Laud') defends also the use of the word *Altar*: he says.—'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper they (the first Reformers) called the Sacrament of the *Altar*, as appears plainly by the Statute 1 *Edw.* VI. (Against speaking irreverently of the Sacrament) . . . Secondly, by BP. RIDLEY . . . who doth not only call it the Sacrament of the *Altar* . . . hut in his reply to an argument of the Bp. of Lincoln's, taken out of S. Cyril, he doth resolve it thus, viz. "the word *Altar* in the Scripture signifieth as well the *Altar* whereon the Jews were wont to offer their hurnt-sacrifice as the *Table* of the Lord's Supper: and that S. Cyril meaneth by this word *Altar*, not the Jewish *Altar*, hut the *Table of the Lord*." &c. (*Acts & Mon.* Pt. iii. p. 492, 497.). Thirdly, by BP. LATIMER, his fellow martyr, who plainly grants "that the *Lord's Table* may be called an *Altar*, and that the Doctors called it so in many places, though there be no propitiatory sacrifice, but only Christ's." (Pt. ii. p. 85). Fourthly, by the several affirmations of JOHN LAMBERT and JOHN PHILPOT, two learned and religious men', &c.—(quoted in *Hier. Anglic.* p. 44.)

BP. SPARROW (*ob.* 1685) observes—‘Now, that no man take offence at the word *Altar*, let him know, that anciently both these names, *Altar*, or *Holy Table*, were used for the same thing; though most frequently the Fathers and Councils use the word *Altar*. And both are fit names for that holy thing: for the holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking of the Bread, and pouring forth the Cup, doing that to the holy symbols, which was done to Christ’s body and blood, and so showing forth and commemorating the Lord’s death, and offering upon it the same sacrifice, that was offered upon the Cross, or rather the commemoration of that sacrifice, *St Chrysostom* in *Heb.* x. 9. it may fitly be called an *Altar*; which again is as fitly called an *Holy Table*, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers. To put all out of doubt; it is questionless lawful and safe to speak the language of the New Testament, and to give this holy thing the name, which is given it there; now there it is called an *Altar*, *Heb.* xiii. 10. “*We have an Altar &c*”... Again, *St. Matt.* v. 23. “*When thou bringest thy gift to the Altar*.”... So that, I hope, we may go on, and call it *Altar* without offence.” (p. 243)—*Rationale*.—This opinion is followed by CLUTTERBUCK, as may be seen quoted in MANT’S *B. of Com. Pr.* p. 280; and in HOOK’S *Ch. Dict. Art.* ‘ALTAR’.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723) states—‘The ancient writers used both names indifferently; some calling it *Altar*, others the ‘*Lord’s Table*,’ the ‘*Holy Table*,’ the ‘*mystical Table*,’ the ‘*tremendous Table*,’ &c.; and sometimes both *Table*, and *Altar*, in the same sentence together. MR. MEDE thinks it was usually called *Altar* for the two first ages, and that the name *Table* is not to be found in any author of those ages now remaining... in the fourth age, one may venture to say there is scarce an author that speaks of the *Lord’s Table*, but he also calls it *Altar*.’—*Antiq. of Christian Ch.* b. viii. c. 6. §. 12.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) remarks—‘*Altar* was the name by which the Holy Board was constantly distinguished for the first 300 years after Christ; during all which time it does not appear that it was above once called *Table*, and that was in a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Xystus of Rome. And when in the 4th century Athanasius called it a *Table*, he thought himself obliged to explain the word, and to let the reader know that by *Table* he meant *Altar*, that being then the constant and familiar name. (JOHNSON’S *Unbloody Sac.* ii. 3. vol. i. p. 300.). Afterwards indeed both names came to be promiscuously used; the one having respect to the oblation of the Eucharist, the other to the participation.... But at the beginning of the Reformation, an unhappy dispute arose, viz:—whether those *Tables of the Altar-fashion*, which had been used in the Popish times, and on which Masses had been celebrated, should still be continued: this point was first started by BP. HOOPER, who, in a Sermon before the King in the 4th year of his reign, declared, “That it would do well that it might please the Magistrate, to turn *Altars* into *Tables*, according to the first institution of Christ; to take away the false persuasion of the people, which they have of sacrifice, to be done upon the *Altars*; for as long, says he, as *Altars*

"remain, both the ignorant people, and the ignorant and evil persuaded Priest will always dream of sacrifice." (HEYLYN'S *Antid. Linc.* 105). This occasioned not only a couple of Letters from the King and Council, one of which was sent to all the Bishops, and the other to Bp. Ridley (see *above*); but also '&c.' (the alteration of the Rubric in the Liturgy of 1552).—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.* p. 258.

With a few modern opinions we will close this division of the subject.—

The ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (*Dr. Musgrave*), when *Bp. of Hereford*, remarked—'Neither ought we in sacred things to use words at random, as if language could never lead to error, whereas, irreparable mischief has often sprung, and may arise again, from the misapplication of words. For instance:—The Church in her Communion-Service speaks of *The Table*,' or *The Lord's Table*,' or *The Holy Table*,' employing, not by accident, but designedly, one or other of these terms no less than sixteen times; whereas, some never speak of the same but as *The Altar*,' a name which our Liturgy seems to have carefully eschewed, because it was felt how much influence there is in a name; and still more because *an Altar* implies a sacrifice, and a sacrifice implies an expiation offered up by him who ministers. A fancy which the Service Book of our Church does not recognize or allow.... and, as Hooker says, "sacrifice is now no part of the Church's Ministry." (p. 30.)—*Charge* 1842.

The BISHOP OF WORCESTER (*Dr. Pepys*) says—'An attempt has, in some cases, been made to substitute a *Stone-Altar* for the *Table* ordinarily used at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Now, if this be done, merely because the old *Altar*, as it existed in our Churches before the Reformation, is a more becoming ornament to a Church than the simple *Communion-Table*, there can be no objection whatever to the *Altar* being used as a *Table*; but an *Altar* implies a sacrifice, and it is to be feared that those who are so zealous for the restoration of the *Altar*, have a tacit leaning to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. It is somewhat extraordinary that this zeal for the restoration of the *Altar* in preference to the *Communion-Table* should exist among those who profess a peculiar respect for the RUBRICS and CANONS of the Church,' &c.—The Bishop then adverts to the Injunctions of Edward, and Elizabeth, the Canons of 1603, and the Revisions of the Liturgy, to show that the word *Table* is the proper designation. (p. 18.)—*Charge*. 1842.

The REV. J. W. HEWETT observes—'The Church of England in her Services uses both names *The Table*,' the *Lord's Table*,' 'the *Holy Table*,' in her Common Prayer Book; *The Altar* in her Coronation Office, and in the Homilies.' (p. 10.)—*Arrangement of Parish Churches*.

Dr. HOOK, defining the term '*Communion-Table*,' says, it is—'a name for the *Altar* in the Christian Church. It is both *Altar* and *Table*. An *Altar* with respect to the oblation; a *Table* with respect to the feast.'—*Ch. Dict.* Art. 'COMMUNION-TABLE.'

The Rev. J. JEBB remarks—‘Much controversy has arisen of late years as to the designation of the *Communion-Table*. By some the use of the word *Altar* has been regarded as the badge of a party: but most unjustly; since either word has long been indifferently employed by many, according to the practice of our best and soundest divines. The exclusive adoption of either designation might indeed justly incur the suspicion of party feeling. The author, therefore, must claim the right which the Church has plainly conceded, of using either term, taught as he has been from childhood to do so, by the example of those who, long before the controversies of the present hour began, kept to the true ‘*via media*’ of the Church of England. That the terms *Holy Table* and *Altar* were interchangeably used from the most ancient time, is a matter of notoriety; and though Origen and others declared that Christian men had no *Altars*, it is plain from the context, that they meant the heathen sense of the word only, since material sacrifices make no part of the Christian Worship. Though the Common Prayer Book does not now retain the word *Altar*, yet it is employed in the Coronation Service.... a coordinate authority with the Prayer Book on all matters in which ritual principle is concerned. An *Altar*, considered in its literal sense, is properly a *table* on which offerings are made: and on the Christian *Altar* there are oblations of alms, and of bread and wine, on which the blessing of God is implored to sanctify them to our spiritual good. Still, as the word *Table* is alone used in our Communion Service, it shall be for that reason here most frequently employed, the word ‘*Holy*’ being prefixed to it as in the Rubric after the Offertory.’ (p. 464.)—*Choral Service*.

SIR HERBERT JENNER FUST, in the case of *Faullhner v. Litchfield and Stearne*,—which was an Appeal to the ‘Arches Court’ (Jan. 31, 1845) against a Faculty permitting an immoveable stone structure to be erected for a *Communion-Table* in the Round Church at Cambridge—delivered a most elaborate judgment, in which he argued at considerable length upon the distinction between an *Altar* and a *Table*, concluding by a reference to the Rubric of our present Liturgy with these remarks:—‘*Table* is used throughout, *Altar* nowhere appears, except in one or two sentences in the Offertory, wherein the word *Altar* was necessarily retained as being the term used in those passages of Scripture whence the sentences were taken.... what is the notion that would present itself to any one’s mind of the word *Table* taken abstractedly? Surely it would not be that of the object now under consideration—a stone structure of amazing weight and dimensions immoveably fixed. It is undoubtedly possible, by an ingenious argument, to contend, that the present erection is a ‘*Table*’; it may be so according to one definition by Dr. Johnson—“a flat surface raised above the ground;” but that notion would not readily present itself to the mind; such is not the ordinary meaning of the word. When I take into consideration, then, that there is nothing whatever, so far as I can see, in the Injunctions and Canons, which I have reviewed, to lead me to a conclusion that the word *Table* in the Book of Common Prayer is to be understood in an unnatural sense, but much the other way, I must pronounce that the structure in question is not a *Communion-Table* within the meaning of the Rubric.’ (1 Rol. 183.)—Also quoted in STEPHENS’ *B. of Com. Pr.* E. II. S. II. 1096; *Ecel. Stat.* 2072; *Laws Rel. to Cl.* 619.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), defining the word *Table*, says—'This word is to be construed according to its usual and popular meaning, and to accord with the letter and spirit of the Rubrics. In point of law, the word '*Table*' is the proper term, and not the word '*Altar*,' notwithstanding the terms '*Holy Table*' and '*Altar*,' were interchangeably used from the most ancient time; but an immoveable structure is not a *Table* within the meaning of the RUBRICS, or Ecclesiastical CANONS (p. 1086.).... Although the Statute Law does not recognize the term '*Altar*,' yet there is nothing Ecclesiastically improper in its use. Thus the '*Lord's Table*,' or the '*Table of the Lord*,' in two cases where it occurs in the Old Testament (*Mal. i. 7. 12.*), is synonymous with *Altar* (p. 1087.).... The mobility or immobility of the piece of Ecclesiastical furniture used in the Communion does not in any way affect the definition. The Altar of Incense was moveable. And there have been moveable Altars in the Christian Church. It was not the name, but the form, material, and immobility of the Altars, which were made the subjects of change in the Church of England (p. 1090.).... In another sense the use of the word *Altar* is proper; that is, as a place upon which offerings of alms, and of bread and wine, are made (p. 1094.).... The United Church of England and Ireland has not repudiated the term *Altar*; it is inserted in the 7th CANON of 1640,' (quoted in p. 295. *supra*). It has been constantly used in the 'Coronation Service,' which has been revised by successive Primates of the Church of England... and has been employed without scruple by the Revisers of our Liturgy, besides being constantly used by many Divines before them, since our Reformation, convertibly with '*Holy Table*' in conformity to ancient and primitive usage,' (p. 1095.)—*Book of Com. Fr. E. H. S.*—This writer says elsewhere; 'The word '*Table*' is to be construed according to its usual and popular meaning; and an immoveable structure, such as a *stone Altar*, is not a Communion-Table within the meaning of the RUBRIC, or of the Ecclesiastical CANONS; in fact, the proper use of a *stone-Altar* is to sacrifice upon—the proper use of a *Table* is to eat upon: exclusive of which, Christ, as ABP. CRANMER observes, Himself instituted the Sacrament upon a *Table*, and not an *Altar*. The true test between an *Altar* and a *Table* seems to be this, that the *Altar* is immoveable, and the *Table* moveable.' (p. 289.)—*Laws Rel. to the Clergy.*

- The QUARTERLY REVIEW touches on this question in its strictures upon Worshipping towards the East, as already quoted in pages 412, 415. *supra*.

ITS MATERIAL.—The use of the word *Table* instead of *Altar* in the RUBRICS, and in the CANON (82d), lead to the inference that the material of which the *Communion-Table* ought to be constructed should be *wood*, and not *stone*, and be moveable. We find, indeed, almost universally that these *Tables* are so made of wood, —generally of oak, more or less carved and ornamented. In many cases, however, where a Parish may have been under the pressure of poverty, or under the influence of a niggard parsimony, or, it may be, of lukewarm indifference to such matters, they are fashioned of



deal, or other inferior wood, and are either plain or painted. Yet in a few instances the original *stone-Altar* has survived uninjured and undisturbed, by reason, probably, of the protecting order of Elizabeth, to which we shall presently refer. But since there is no specific LAW, CANON, or RUBRIC, defining the material, or the style of the *Communion-Table*, its construction is generally left to the judgment of the Churchwardens, restrained, however, by the conditions of the CANON, to provide what shall be 'convenient and decent,' and shall fulfil all the requirements of a *table*. Very frequently the Incumbent is tacitly permitted by these Church Officers to exercise his own liberality and taste in this matter: which will in numerous instances account for the elaborate design and decorative character of many of the *Communion-Tables* that may now be met with. It has been decided in the Ecclesiastical Court, in the case of *Faulkner v. Litchfield & Stearne* (Chws. of Holy Sepulchre (the Round Church) in Cambridge), that a *stone structure*, whether designated a 'table' or an 'altar,' does not accord with the intention of the CANON and the RUBRICS, and is therefore *illegal*. A few historical evidences, and Ecclesiastical opinions, will confirm this important judgment, and doubtlessly prove otherwise interesting.

In the earliest ages of the Church, as may be gathered from the testimony of OPTATUS<sup>a</sup> (*fl.* A. D. 364—375), when speaking of the outrages of the Donatists, and of ST AUSTIN<sup>b</sup> (*fl.* A. D. 386—430), the Christian *Altars*, or *Tables*, were made of *wood*, which is also confirmed by ATHANASIUS<sup>c</sup> (*fl.* A. D. 325—372.). From GREGORY NYSSEN, however, (who *fl.* A. D. 372—400.) we learn, that in his time *Altars* began to be made of *stone*; and in the next age the Council of *Epone* (A. D. 509.) in France passed a decree that no *Altars* should be consecrated, but such as were of *stone*. According to CARDINAL BONA, whether *wood* or *stone*, was employed in the first ages is a matter of doubt, he says—'Primis Ecclesiæ sæculis an *lignea* fuerint, vel *lapidea*, non liquet;' and when referring to the testimony of ATHANASIUS, he remarks—'Ex quibus intelligimus promiscuum tunc usum in Oriente *lignei* et *lapidei* viguisse.' But MERATI says—'Communis fert eruditorum opinio 'primis Ecclesiæ temporibus Altaria fuisse *lignea*.' However, the decree of the Council of *Epone* 'seems to be,' says BINGHAM, 'the first public Act of this nature, that we have upon authentic record in ancient history. And from the time of this change in the matter of them, the *form* or *fashion* of them changed likewise. For whereas before they were in the *form of tables*, they now began to be erected more like *Altars*, either upon a single foot or

<sup>a</sup> OPTAT. l. VI. p. 94.

<sup>b</sup> AUG. Ep. 50. ad Bonifac. p. 84.

<sup>c</sup> ATHAN. Ep. ad Solitar. Vetam. agentes. t. l. p. 847.

<sup>d</sup> NYSSEN de Bapt. Chr. t. 3. p. 369.

<sup>e</sup> BONA de Reb. Lit. l. I. c. 20. p. 251.

<sup>f</sup> GAVANTI. Thesaur. I. 130.

'pillar in the midst, or upon an edifice erected like a tomb, as if it were some monument of a martyr.'—*Antiq. of Christian Church*. b. VIII. c. 6. §. 15.

Thus, then, down to the period of the Reformation *stone Altars* existed almost universally: and their prevailing, if not, indeed, indispensable characteristic was, that they should be fixed and immoveable, and in the form of the tombs of the Martyrs. DR. FULKE, when speaking of the earliest English translation of the Bible, affirms that—in King HENRY VIIIth's time, when 'that translation was first printed there was never a *Communion-Table* in any Church in England.' (*Def of Trans.* P. S. ed. p. 518.).

In 1550. At the beginning of the reign of EDWARD VI., when the performance of the '*Mass*' made way for the celebration of the '*Lord's Supper*,' Altars were converted into *Tables*: at first by the 'irregular forwardness' of the people, who set about the violent destruction of all Altars; and afterwards by the sanction of public authority. BP. RIDLEY seems to have taken the initiative in this matter by calling upon the Curates, Churchwardens, and Questmen, in the Visitations he held through his Diocese of London (in 1550), 'to take down and abolish all Altars,' and 'to erect and set up the '*Lord's Board* after the form of an *honest Table*.' This measure was confirmed by an order of Council in the same year; and the demolition of *stone-Altars* continued, more or less, throughout the remainder of Edward's reign; the work being advanced or retarded, according as the doctrinal views of the Bishops of the several Dioceses were favourable or otherwise to such proceedings. On the accession of MARY, *stone-Altars*, as may be imagined, were gradually restored; but the protestant bias of her successor ELIZABETH revived again the destructive process, although the few Romanist predilections this Queen continued to cherish, led her to restrain the popular violence.

In 1559. Among the Injunctions of Elizabeth it was ordered:—

'Whereas, her Majesty understandeth, that in many and sundry 'parts of the Realm the *Altars* of the Churches be removed, and '*Tables* placed for the Administration of the Holy Sacrament, 'according to the form of the Law\* therefore provided; and in 'some other places, the *Altars* be not yet removed, upon opinion 'conceived of some other order therein to be taken by her Majesty's Visitors; in the order whereof, saving for an uniformity, 'there seemeth no matter of great moment, so that the Sacrament be 'duly and reverently ministered; yet for observation of one Uniformity through the whole Realm, and for the better imitation 'of the Law in that behalf, it is ordered, that no *Altar* be taken 'down but by oversight of the Curate of the Church and the

---

\* The *Law* here referred to is doubtlessly the *Order of Council* despatched to RIDLEY, and the other Bishops, in 1550, directing them to take down *Altars*, and place *Communion-Tables* in their stead. For no *Statute Law* was passed in the reign of Edward, or of Elizabeth, for the removal of Altars. See HEYLYN'S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. I. 269; CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* I. 89.

'Churchwardens, or one of them at the least, wherein no riotous or 'disordered manner be used.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* I. 201.).

1564—In the same *Injunction*, direction is also given that 'the *Holy Table* be decently made.' Subsequently, in the 'BOOK OF ADVERTISEMENTS' in 1564, it was ordered to be 'a decent *Table standing on a frame*,' (*ib.* I. 292.). In the Visitation Articles of ABP. PARKER in 1569, it was to be 'a comly and decent *Table*' (*ib.* I. 320.). In the CANONS of 1571, it was to be '*Mensam ex asseribus composite junctam*.' (SPARROW'S *Coll.* 235.).

BP. JEWEL (*ob.* 1571.), in answering HARDING'S attack upon his 'Apology,' refers to this subject in these words—'As for the *Altars*, which OPTATUS saith the Donatists brake down, they were certainly *Tables of wood*, such as we have, and not heaps of stones such as ye have.' (p. 315.)—*Def. of Apol.*

In the CANONS of 1603-4, now binding upon us, and which is the last authoritative order on this subject, it is directed to be 'a convenient and decent *Table*.'

It appears then, from all these documentary evidences, that the form of a *Table* is a point determined, but the material of which it should be constructed, is open to 'doubt and diversity,' and, like all other 'doubts and diversities,' is to be set at rest by the Ordinary.

The usage of the succeeding times, may be gathered from the following:—

BP. MONTAGUE (*ob.* 1641.), in his Visitation Articles, inquires—'Is your *Communion Table*, or *Altar*, of stone, wainscot, joiner's work, strong, fair, and decent?'—(*Camb.* ed. p. 50.).

ABP. WILLIAMS (*ob.* 1650), when *Bp. of Lincoln*, forbid the Vicar of Grantham, (who, in an angry mood with his parishioners, had threatened to erect a *stone-Altar*), to dispense with the *wooden Table*; informing him that *tables of stone*, and fixed in one place, were contrary to the injunctions of the Church.—(HOLY TABLE, *Name and Thing.* p. 13.).

Other instances are given in the HIERURGIA ANGLICANA (p. 42), to which we may refer those of our Readers, who wish for any further elucidations of that age; in the mean time we will proceed to quote a few modern opinions.

The BISHOP OF WINCHESTER (*Dr. Sumner*), observes—'It is in itself wholly indifferent whether the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be administered from a 'Table' of wood, or stone. But when it becomes significant, as connected with an expiatory and propitiatory, though unbloody sacrificial offering, it is taken out of the category of things immaterial. And therefore our Reformers were so far from thinking it a matter of indifference that they contended most earnestly on this point.... And on this point we may be thankful that we have now a legal interpretation of our Church's doctrine, delivered authoritatively *ex cathedrâ*. Henceforth *stone-Altars* have no sufferance of standing place in our Chancels.'—*Charge.* 1845.

The BISHOP OF CALCUTTA (*Dr. Daniel Wilson*), says—‘I know not that I need add, that I prohibit altogether *stone-Altars*, *Credence-Tables*, and other Popish usages in this Diocese.’ (*p. 73.*)—*Farnwell Charge*. 1845.

The REV. J. W. HEWETT writes—‘It may be of *metal*, *stone*, or *wood*; all three are ancient and common; but the latter two only have been employed since the Reformation; and of these, *wood*, which is most usual, is also the most primitive.... Notwithstanding the famous recent decision of the *Court of Arches*, I will venture to plead on behalf of *stone-Altars*, durability, here more than elsewhere is to be desired, and a greater security against profanation. The requirement of the Canons is, that Altars be moveable.’ (*p. 9.*)—*Arrangement of Parish Churches*.

DR. HOOK remarks—‘Although there is no doubt that the *Altar* in the primitive Church was always of *wood*, yet for many ages, and throughout the whole of the time to which we look for architectural examples, *Altars* were of *stone*.’ (*p. 18.*).... ‘*Altar stones* not *in situ*, but used in pavements and all places, are almost innumerable, sometimes two, or three, or more, occurring in a single small Church. They may be recognized by *five little crosses*, one in the centre, and one at each corner.’ (*p. 19.*)—*Ch. Dict. Art. ALTAR.*’

The REV. G. A. POOLE states—‘The first Christian *Altars* were of *wood*; and were in fact the ordinary *tables* which were found in the upper chambers, and other places of the like sort in which the Christian assemblies were held.... even after the time of Constantine *Altars* were for a long time generally of *wood*.’ (*p. 103.*) After referring to the outrages of the Donatists, the author proceeds—‘It is certain, however, that long before the time at which OPTATUS wrote, *stone-Altars* were in use.... They chose very often the spot on which some martyr had received his crown; and his tomb being erected on the place, furnished the *Altar* of a Christian Church.... But Churches soon multiplied beyond the number of martyrs.... and still a *stone-Altar* was raised, and by and by it became customary even to transport the relics of saints, and bury them under the *Altars* of new Churches. Hence arose the custom, at last almost universal, and eventually enjoined by the Church of Rome, of having none but *stone-Altars*, enclosing relics of the saints. (*p. 104.*).... The ancient *Altars* of *stone* were marked with *five crosses*, in allusion to the five wounds of our Blessed Lord. This is very carefully to be noted, because the crosses still remaining are often the only means we have of distinguishing an *Altar-stone* from the rest of the pavement into which it is very often inserted.’ (*p. 105.*) ‘At the Reformation all the *Altars* except the *High-Altar*, were ordered to be removed; so that now the *High-Altar* alone remains in any Church still used, and that is the only one erected in a new Church.’ (*p. 106.*)—*Churches, their Structure, &c.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON says—‘It would seem that the authority of our Church is, in its apparent meaning, adverse to the use of *Stone-Altars*.... and in later documents, such as the CANONS of 1604, and 1640, it is assumed that the substitution of *Tables* had been universal. The RUBRIC, and all other rules, which suppose the *Table* to be moveable, suppose as a necessary consequence that it is not a solid structure of stone; and while the mere name of *Table* determines nothing as to the material,

‘I have met with no reason for doubting, and with many for believing, that in the 16th century the word was intended and understood, with reference to this subject, to denote a *table of wood*. And even if this be not allowed, there can be no doubt that the *form* of a table was intended to be generally observed. Although, however, the apparent bearing of Rubrics, Canons, Injunctions, and historical evidence, is against the employment of stone, there are circumstances which favour the opinion that this material, and also the form of an *Altar*, may be borne with.... I conceive, therefore, notwithstanding the provisions of the Rubric &c., that a Bishop has power to sanction the employment of a *Stone Table* or *Altar*, if in his opinion neither superstition nor scandal be likely to result. With respect, however, to persons who in our day may be desirous of reviving the use of *stone Altars*, it may be well to make two remarks—(1.) If *stone* be insisted on as necessary for the purpose of setting forth or symbolizing any theological opinion, that opinion must be one which neither the primitive Church, nor the reformed Church of England has deemed it necessary to express in any such manner. (2.) If the superior appearance be the ground of preference, the following observation of MR. JEBB deserves attention:—(the quotation refers to the *Table* being completely covered, and thus concludes) ‘There is no authority for the practice now frequently adopted, of leaving the stone or wooden front and side of the *Altar* exposed. (*Choral Serv.*)’—*How shall we Conform to Lit.* p. 165.

SIR HERBERT JENNER FUST, (*Dean of the Court of Arches*) in the recent case of *Faulkner v. Litchfield and Stearne*, remarks in the course of his judgment—‘The early Christians performed their rites and ceremonies in any place to which they could resort with safety, and very frequently at the tombs of martyrs, whence it was that *Altars* afterwards assumed the form of tombs. Under these circumstances it was that *Altars* came to be erected in the Church; and there are several authorities to which I could refer, to show that it was held to be generally requisite that there should be certain relics deposited. I think I may now assume the fact, that at the time of the Reformation this was the usual form of *Altars* in most Churches: they were certainly made of stone; they were fixed and immoveable, and the generality of them were in the form of the tombs of the martyrs. Such was the description of *Altar* which was to be got rid of at this time, in order to remove as far as possible all those superstitious notions which attached to the performance of those Services in the Church of Rome, which were connected with the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, or the change of the elements of the Lord’s Supper.’—The learned judge then proceeded to discuss the appellation of ‘*Altar*’ and ‘*Table*’ (as quoted in part in p. 533. *supra*), and deciding against the use of a *stone Altar*, condemned the Churchwardens in the costs of the proceedings.—(1 Rob. 184; 3 N. E. C. 511.).

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*), leaning upon the above decision, observes—‘This *Table* must be moveable and made of wood. A *stone-Altar* is not a *Communion-Table* within the meaning of the Rubric and Canon, and, whether fixed to the freehold or not, cannot lawfully be substituted for a moveable wooden *Table*.’—*Chm. Guide*, p. 43. n.

MR. F. N. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*), refers also to the above judgment, adding—‘An immoveable structure of *stone* cannot be considered as a *Communion-Table* within the meaning of the ‘Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, and the Canons Ecclesiastical.’ (p. 154.)—*Eccl. Law*.

MR. A. J. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), quotes in his several Ecclesiastical Works, the judgment of Sir H. J. FUST *in extenso*. He moreover says—‘There are numerous *Altars* in English Churches, new and old, entirely of *stone*: such as that in Westminster Abbey, erected about 30 years since. Some are supported on stone pillars, others have stone frontals &c. &c. The ‘Altar in St. Andrew’s, Holborn, is of *iron*, with a stone slab, and ‘two super-Altars of marble.’ (p. 1089.)—*B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. The *iron frontal* is ornamented with a dove in a nimbus encircled with rays. It is said to have been designed by SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN.

DR. A. WADDILOVE (*Advocate of Doct. Coms.*), referring to the same decision, says—‘An Altar made of stone, immoveable, being fixed in the floor and the walls of the Church, was held not to be ‘such a Communion-Table as would come within the meaning of ‘the Rubric.’ (p. 65.)—*Digest of Eccl. Law*.

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE defines an *Altar* as—‘An elevated *Table* in Christian Churches, dedicated to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist only. They were generally of *wood* during the first four or five centuries of the Christian era, but the Council of Epone in France, A. D. 509, commanded that “no *Altars* should be consecrated with the chrism of holy oil, but such as were made of *stone* only,” and this custom gradually prevailed until the Reformation. The slab forming the *Altar* was sometimes supported on pillars, sometimes on brackets, but usually on solid masonry. It was marked with *five crosses* cut on the top, in allusion to the five wounds of Christ....In England the *Altars* were generally taken down in, or about the year 1550....The ‘Altars were set up again in the beginning of the reign of Queen Mary, and again removed in the second year of Queen Elizabeth....but a few of them, and some of the *Chantry Altars* in the ‘Aisles and Chapels have escaped.’ (Vol. I. p. 8.).

In a Tract “A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS,” it is remarked:—‘I have seen some Tables that would not be thought ‘good enough for a kitchen, and some which serve also as cupboard boards for books and cushions: nay, the Church-Chest itself is in ‘one place used for the Altar, and in another the same thing serves ‘both for an Altar and a stove! and though these be covered with ‘showy Altar-cloths, their meanness is not the more excusable, ‘because it is hidden from man’s view. Another way is to have ‘a *Table* on one or two legs with large claws, like a drawing-room ‘table: but this is at least well meant, however unsuitable and ‘ridiculous. I wonder men are not ashamed to use the Holy Table ‘for a tool-box or work-bench while repairs are going on: and it is ‘nearly as bad to make it the place for hats and shawls to be ‘thrown on by school children and others, or a desk for the registering of Marriages, or Baptisms.’ (Pt. II. p. 8.)—Pub. by the Ecclesiological Society.

III. ITS PLACE.—Neither the RUBRICS of the Liturgy, nor the CANONS of the Church, determine with precision the question we are now about to discuss. There is not to be found in them any practical allusion to the place of the *Communion-Table* at the time there is *no* Administration of the Lord's Supper; and even where there is an Administration, they merely prescribe that the *Table* shall be placed in the Church, or in the Chancel; indicating neither the spot it shall occupy, nor the direction it shall assume. Custom, however, which in this respect is now almost universal, has assigned to the *Communion-Table* since the last Review of the Liturgy (1662) a permanent (not fixed) position *under the east wall* of the Chancel, (or of the Church, if there be no Chancel), both during the Administration of the Holy Communion, and at all other times:—here with very few exceptions it now stands, *lengthwise*, with its ends pointing one to the *north*, and the other to the *south*. If a more convenient position is required for it during Communion-time, permission to remove it must be obtained from the Ordinary before such a step can be taken.

For a long period, the situation of the *Communion-Table* was a very controverted subject, and involved two important theological questions. It will be necessary therefore in our efforts to elucidate the RUBRIC and the CANON, to present an historical, yet brief, summary of the point disputed: bringing forward, first of all, the RUBRIC and the CANON by which we are now bound.

The RUBRIC, which will be found at the beginning of the 'Communion Office' in our present Book of Common Prayer, enjoins:—

¶. '*The TABLE at the Communion-time having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church or in the Chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said. And the Priest standing at the North-side of the TABLE shall say*' &c.—1552—1662. (KEELING, 166.)

This RUBRIC was introduced into the *second Liturgy* of EDWARD VI. (1552) to meet the new order of things occasioned by the substitution of *Tables* for *Altars*, and it has continued without alteration in all the subsequent Reviews of the Book of Common Prayer.\*

\* In the AMERICAN LITURGY this *Rubric* has been amended as follows:—

'*The TABLE &c. shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel. And the Minister, standing at the right side of the*

The next authority affecting us at the present day is the 82nd CANON of 1603-4; which thus directs:—

‘We appoint that the same *Tables* shall...so stand’ (*how* is not mentioned), ‘saving when the said Holy Communion is to be administered: *at which time* the same shall be placed in so good sort within the Church or Chancel, as thereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard of the Communicants in his Prayer and Ministration, and the Communicants also more conveniently, and in more number, may communicate with the said Minister.’—CANON 82.

What is to be understood by the expression, ‘*so stand*,’ in the above CANON, is the hinge upon which the whole argument turns: and this we must now proceed to consider.

When *Altars* were supplanted by *Tables* (in 1550) and the notion of a ‘sacrifice’ was to make way for the impression of a ‘feast,’ every attribute belonging to an ‘altar’ was studiously guarded against and opposed: the *Table* was to be not only moveable, but it was to be moved for the administration of the ‘Communion,’ and not suffered at other times to stand in the place or posture of an ‘*Altar*.’ To meet therefore the requirements of the RUBRIC (of 1552) which appears to have followed in the wake of popular feeling, ‘the upper quire in St. Paul’s Church, where the *High-Altar* stood’ observes HEYLYN ‘was broken down, and all the quire thereabout; and the *Communion-Table* was placed in the lower part of the quire, where the Priest sang the Daily Service.’ (*Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. i. 269). WHEATLY, however, says, that Bp. RIDLEY ‘suffered the *Table* to stand in the place of the old *Altar*; but beating down the wainscot partition behind, laid all the Choir open to the east, leaving the *Table* then to stand in the middle of the Chancel, which indeed was more agreeable to the primitive custom.’ (*Com. Pr.* p. 259.) Continued disputes, however arose, with regard to the position of the *Table* from the indefiniteness of the RUBRIC, and consequently great diversity of usage: in some Churches the *Tables* were placed in the middle of the Chancels; in others at the eastern part next to the wall: in some again the ends of the *Tables* were pointed to the east and west, in others to the north and south.

The contention went on, interrupted only by the brief reign of MARY, till in the time of ELIZABETH, an attempt was made to effect an uniformity of practice in this respect by an order in one of the Queen’s ‘Injunctions’ (1559). Here after directing that *Altars* should not be removed but by the proper authorities (which portion of the Injunction has been already quoted in p. 536.), it went on to say:—

‘And that the *Holy Table* in every Church be decently made, and set in the place, where the *Altar* stood, and there commonly covered, as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the Visitors, and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be administered; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the Chancel, as thereby,’ &c.

---

‘*Table, or where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said, shall say*’ &c.—DR. WAINWRIGHT’S Ed. *New York*, 1845.



(*here follows as in CANON 82. quoted above, p. 542.*)....' And 'after the Communion done from time to time the same holy Table to be placed where it stood before.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 201.)

This is evidently the origin of our present CANON (82nd), which, as may have been perceived, is rendered obscure by the omission of two important clauses bearing on the very question of the situation of the *Communion Table*. The above 'Injunction' however was not sufficiently explicit, and therefore did not answer the end designed; the Bishops were consequently induced shortly after (1561) to put forth the following interpretation—'That the Table be removed out of the Chancel into the body of the Church before the Chancel door; where either the Choir seemeth to be too little, or at great feasts of receivings. And at the end of the Communion to be set up again, according to the Injunctions'—(*ib.* p. 205. See also HEYLYN'S *Rcf.* E. H. S. II. 286.). This removal of the Table was also confirmed in the 'Orders taken the tenth day of October in the 3rd year of the reign of Elizabeth,' thus—'If in any Chancel the steps be transposed, that they be not erected again, but that the place be decently paved, where the Communion-Table shall stand out of the times of receiving the Communion, having thereon' &c.—(*Brit. Mag.* October, 1848, p. 419; GOODE'S *Cer. of Ch. of Eng.* p. 83).

These measures seem to have had little effect in assuaging the spirit of controversy; various practices continued to prevail in Parish Churches; and in *Canterbury Cathedral* even the Communion-Table appears to have 'stood, ordinarily, north and south; but at the time of Communion it was set east and west;' (STRYPE'S *Parker*, p. 183.): which was contrary to the usual practice: for, generally speaking, Royal, and Private Chapels, and Cathedrals, were independent of these regulations. But the question shortly after became still more difficult of adjustment by an order, which appeared in the 'Book of Advertisements' (1564-5) to 'sett the Tenne Commandmentes upon the easte walle over the saide Table'; (CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 292.): this was among the directions of the Queen, expressed in her letter to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners despatched in 1560. (*ib.* 202.). This injunction was interpreted by some as implying that the Communion-Table should remain under the east wall, even during Communion-time; of which opinion were BP. WREN, HEYLYN, and others; on the contrary side were BP. WILLIAMS, and his party, who maintained that the Table should be then removed, according to the new practice.

In 1603-4 the CANONS appeared, without adding any weight to either opinion. At last the difference in the position of the Communion Table became a decided symbol of the two parties in the Church; 'one party,' says DR. CARDWELL, 'desired that it should be placed in the body of the Church, in order that the Eucharist might be considered as a religious feast; the other wished it to be placed altar-wise at the east end of the Chancel, in order that it might correspond with the nature of a religious sacrifice.'—(*Doc. Ann.* ii. 174.).

In 1633 ABP. ABBOT, otherwise an advocate of the puritan side, seemed inclined to favour the retaining of the Communion-Table in

the eastern part of the Chancel; for he decided in the matter of *Crayford Church* brought before him for adjudication, that the Communicants 'should repair unto the two ascents, or foot paces 'in the Chancel before the Communion-Table, and there... kneel.'—(*ib.* 175.).

In this same year, LAUD having in the meantime succeeded to the *Primacy*, the parishioners of *St Gregory's Church* near St Paul's, appealed to the King in Council against a decree of the Court of Arches, which had decided for the removal of the Communion Table 'from the middle of the Chancel to the upper end, and there placed altar-wise, in such manner as it standeth in the said Cathedral &c., which removing and placing of it in that sort 'was done by order of the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's, who are 'Ordinaries thereof.' After hearing was granted, the Council decided against the Parishioners, remarking—'for so much as 'concerns the liberty of the said COMMON PRAYER BOOK, or 'CANON, for placing the Communion-Table in any Church or 'Chapel with more conveniency; that liberty is not so to be 'understood, as if it were even left to the discretion of the Parish, 'much less to the particular fancy of any humorous person, but to 'the judgment of the Ordinary, to whose place and function it 'doth properly belong.'—(*ib.* 185.).

ABP. LAUD, determined to take advantage of this order in Council, and immediately set about a reformation of the abuses which had crept in by means of the late dissensions, and to establish, if possible, a uniform practice. He found that in numerous instances the Communion-Table had been suffered, either from negligence or indifference, to remain in the place it had occupied during the time of the Communion—sometimes in the body of the Church, sometimes in the middle of the Chancel—and been there exposed to gross and open profanation: he therefore ordered it to be set up *altar-wise* at the east end of the Chancel, where it was at all times to continue, and to 'be decently severed by Rails.' This as might be supposed produced considerable opposition.

In 1636. BP. WREN, among his directions given in the Diocese of Norwich, seconded the views of LAUD, and ordered—'That the 'Communion-Table in every Church do always stand close under 'the east-wall of the Chancel, the ends thereof north and south, 'unless the Ordinary give particular direction otherwise; and that 'the Rail' &c.—(*CARDWELL'S Doc. Ann.* ii. 202.).

About this period a warm disputation arose with regard to this question between WILLIAMS, *Bp. of Lincoln*, and DR. HEYLYN, *Abp. Laud's Chaplain*, professedly in consequence of WILLIAMS some nine years before, having interposed his authority to prevent *Titly*, the Vicar of Grantham, 'from standing the Communion-Table *Altar-wise*.' The Letter of WILLIAMS to *Titly* was written in 1627, and the matter was revived at this time by the enemies of the Bishop to damage him with the Star-Chamber. HEYLYN's attack was entitled a 'Coal from the Altar'; the answer of WILLIAMS was designated 'The Holy Table, Name and Thing'; and HEYLYN's rejoinder was called 'Antidotum Lincolnense.' HEYLYN charged the Bishop with adopting in his Cathedral at Lincoln, in his Church at Westminster of which he was Dean, and in his private Chapel, the very practice he was condemning. But the

prohibition of WILLIAMS only extended to the usage in Parish Churches. (HEYLYN'S *Life, in Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. i. CVIII—X.) MR. ROBERTSON says, 'he ordered that at Communion it be placed 'according to convenience; that at other times it stand in the east, 'but with its ends east and west. If the position in the east were 'found convenient at all times, still he considered it uncanonical to 'fix the Table.' (*Holy Table*, 13. 19. 204.)—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.* 159.

In 1637 we have the *Rubrical* direction of the Prayer Book inserted in the SCOTCH LITURGY, with emendations, doubtless from the pen of LAUD: it runs thus—

'The holy TABLE having at the Communion-time a Carpet, 'and a fair white linen Cloth upon it, with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall 'stand at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church 'where the Presbyter standing at the north-side or end 'thereof shall say,' &c.—(KEELING, 166.).

Here we find 'side' and 'end' made synonymous. While it is thought by many that 'side' previously had reference to that position of the Communion-Table in which the ends were east and west.

In 1638. BP. MONTAGUE enjoined that the Table—'be fixedly 'set in such convenient sort and place within the Chancel as hath 'been appointed by authority, according to the practice of the 'ancient Church; i. e. at the east end of the Chancel, close unto 'the wall upon an ascent or higher ground'—(quoted in ROBERTSON'S *How shall we Conform to Lit.* p. 158.).

In 1640 were put forth the *Laudian* CANONS, the VIIth of which goes fully into this question; and while declaring the position of the Communion-Table to be a matter of indifference, yet recommends that it should 'stand sideways under the east window'; adding 'We judge it fit and convenient that all Churches and Chapels do 'conform themselves in this particular to the example of the 'Cathedral or Mother Churches, saving always the general 'liberty left to the Bishop by law during the time of Administration of the Holy Communion.' (This CANON is quoted in *extenso* in page 295.).

In 1641, among the 'Innovations' charged against the *Laudian* divines by the Committee appointed by the House of Lords, was—'The turning of the *Holy Table*, altar-wise, and most commonly 'calling it an Altar'—(CARDWELL'S *Conf.* 272.).

At length the establishment of the COMMONWEALTH cut short this time-worn controversy; and the *Restoration* brought with it, not only the revised LITURGY (1662) we now acknowledge, but the settled usage prevailing with us at this day, of standing the Communion Table 'en permanence' under the east window, with its ends north and south.

A few Ecclesiastical opinions may now be necessary to confirm what has been here advanced.

L. ESTRANGE remarks, after a comparison of the Royal Injunctions, the Rubrics, and the Canon with each other, that—'The *Table* placed where the *Altar* stood, was but reposed, *set out of the way*, during only the time of non-communication.' (p. 166.)—*Alliance*. (ed. A. D. 1650.)

DR. BENNET, drawing his conclusions apparently from HEYLYN'S *Antid. Linc.* to which he refers, thus remarks—'When the Communion is not celebrated, our Law requires that the *Table* should be placed *close to the east wall* of the Chancel, the shorter *sides or ends* thereof pointing northward and southward. (See DR. HEYLYN'S *Antid. Linc.* c. 2. p. 45. *Lond.* 1637). But at the *Communion-time* the RUBRIC says, it shall stand in the body of the Church or in the Chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said. However, custom has generally prevailed, that it shall stand in the Chancel at Communion-time. And our governors manifestly approve of it. And if it stand in the Chancel, I think it ought in any wise to stand *close to the east wall*. But it may be objected, that the RUBRIC determines it to the *middle of the Chancel*. To this, I answer, that the word *body* has no relation to the word *Chancel*. For the RUBRIC does not say '*in the body of the Church, or of the Chancel*'; but '*in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel*.' So that the word *Chancel* is not put in the genitive case, and governed of '*body*'; but in the ablative case, and governed by *in*.—The author then refers to the RUBRIC before the '*Commandments*,' thus—'*Then shall the Priest* (who stands at the north side or end of the *Table*) *turning to the people &c.*... But if the *Table* be in the middle of the Chancel, and the People consequently round about the Minister; how shall the Minister turn to the People at the reading the *Commandments*, more than he did before? If the *Table* be *close to the east wall*, the Minister stands on the north side, and looks southward; and then turning to the westward, he looks full towards all the People. But if the *Table* be in the *middle of the Chancel*, he cannot so turn to them. (See also DR. HEYLYN'S *Antid. Linc.* p. 58.)—*Paraphrase of B. of Com. Pr.* p. 154. ed. A. D. 1708.

ARCHDEACON SHARP, commenting upon the *Rubric* directing the situation of the Communion-Table, and upon the other *Rubric* appointing that '*the Priest shall stand at the north-side of the Table*, says—'In one case the direction is to the *Priest*, in the other he is not charged with the execution of the injunction; and therefore it concerns not him in particular, but rather appertains to the Ordinary to take care of. And whosoever considers the unhappy disputes and contentions that have arisen in this Church concerning the disposal or situation of "*the Lord's Table* in the Church or Chancel," which lasted from the reign of *Edward VI.* down to the great Rebellion, will think our governors highly prudent in forbearing to give any orders of late years touching that point. The dispute is now dead, and it is to be hoped will never be revived.' (p. 55. n.)—*On Rubric and Canons*. Charge, A. D. 1734.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742), speaking of the alteration made in the *Rubric* in 1552, says—'But this did not put an end to the controversy; another dispute arising, viz. whether the *Table* placed in

'the room of the Altar ought to stand *altar-wise*, i. e. in the same place and situation as the *Altar* formerly stood? This was the occasion that in some Churches the Tables were placed in the middle of the Chancels, in others at the east part thereof next to the wall; some again placing it end-wise, and others placing it at length.' (p. 259.)... The author then refers to the proceedings of Bp. RIDLEY at St Paul's, and after quoting the 'Injunction' of Elizabeth on this subject, adds—'It is plain from this *Injunction*, as well as from the 82nd CANON of the Church (which is almost verbatim the same) that there is no obligation arising from this RUBRIC to move the *Table* at the time of the Communion, unless the People cannot otherwise conveniently hear and communicate. The 'Injunction' declares, that the *holy Table is to be set in the same place where the Altar stood*, which every one knows was at the east end of the Chancel. And when both the *Injunction* and CANON speak of its being moved at the time of the Communion, it supposes that the Minister could not otherwise be heard: the interposition of a *Belfry* between the Chancel and body of the Church hindering the Minister in some Churches from being heard by the People, if he continued in the Chancel. So that we are not under any obligation to move the *Table*, unless necessity requires. But whenever the Churches are built so as the *Minister can be heard, and conveniently administer the Sacrament* at the place where the *Table* usually stands, he is rather obliged to administer in the Chancel, as appears from the RUBRIC before the 'Commandments,' as also from that before the 'Absolution' &c.... From whence I argue, that if the *Table* be in the middle of the Church, and the People consequently round about the Minister, the Minister cannot turn himself to the people any more at one time than another. Whereas if the *Table* be close at the east wall, the Minister stands on the north side, and looks southward, and consequently by looking westward, turns himself to the People. Wherever it be placed the Priest is obliged to stand at the north side (or end thereof, as the Scotch Liturgy expresses it...) the design of which is that the Priest may be the better seen and heard: which as our *Altars* are now placed he cannot be, but at the north or south side.' (p. 260.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

SHEPHERD (ob. 1805.) observes upon this *Rubric*—'The words "where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said," ought to have been expunged, after the place was transferred from the *Table* to the Reading-Desk'.—*Eluc. of B. of C. Pr.* ii. 167. n.

But we will now pass to a few more modern authorities.

DR. CARDWELL says:—'It seems to have been the practice in Churches to place the Communion-Table for the Administration of the Sacrament in such a central situation as might be most convenient for the Minister and the Communicants. This practice began in the reign of King Edward VI.... It continued also in the time of Queen Elizabeth, from whose Injunctions it is evident that the *Table* when required for the Communion was removed from its customary position, where the *Altar* had formerly stood, and was placed in a more convenient situation

'within the Church. The same practice has also been commended  
'by BP JEWEL... by Bp. Babington, by Dr. Fulke, and other  
'eminent divines. But independently of the disorder which had in  
'some places arisen from the practice, and the greater degree of  
'external observance, that had gradually been gaining ground in  
'religious observances, the position of the *Table* had now become  
'the token of a distinct and solemn belief as to the nature of the  
'Eucharist, and was therefore treated as a question of conscience  
'and an article of faith. The Archbishop's (LAUD'S) religious  
'opinions coincided with the strictest view of the case; and having  
'this order of Council in his favour he proceeded gradually to estab-  
'lish a uniform practice respecting it. For *Cathedrals* he required  
'that the *Altar* should be placed at the east end, and be provided  
'with Candlesticks, Bason, Carpet, and other furniture... For *Parish*  
'*Churches*, he ordained that the *Table* should stand close  
'under the east wall of the chancel, the ends thereof north and  
'south, and that the *Rail* be made before it, *reaching across from*  
'*the north wall to the south*. These regulations, however, did not  
'generally take effect till about the year 1636, and not without  
'the greatest opposition.'—*Doc Ann.* ii. 185. n.

The REV. W. GOODE, in his remarks upon the *Rubric* preceding the Prayer of Consecration, speaks of the position of the *Table*, adding—'which is now (whether according to the direction of the  
'original *Rubric* still remaining before the Service, or not) placed  
'against the wall at Communion-time, as well as other times. Now  
'the Divines who introduced this *Rubric* in 1662 probably contem-  
'plated the *Table* being in the position in which it is now ordinarily  
'placed.' (p. 18).—*Cer. of Ch. of England*.

DR. HOOK says—'The place of the *High-Altar* is uniformly,  
'in England at least, at the east of the Church; but in large  
'Churches, room is left for processions to pass behind it, and, in  
'Cathedral Churches of Norman foundation, for the Bishop's  
'throne. Where the end of the Church was apsidal, the *High-*  
'*Altar* was placed in the chord of the apse... In form the *High-*  
'*Altar* was generally large and plain, relying for decoration wholly  
'on the rich furniture with which it was loaded; very rarely its  
'front was panelled or otherwise ornamented... *In situ* but few  
'*High-Altars* remain' (p. 18).—*Church Dict. Art.* 'ALTAR'.

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, after an historical review of this subject, and to which we would refer our Readers for fuller information, deduces these conclusions—'(1). That the *Rubric*, and  
'the *Canon* of 1604, favour the removal of the *Holy Table* at Com-  
'munion-time: (2) That the usual position before ABP. LAUD'S  
'reforms was with the ends east and west; and this is countenanced  
'by the *Rubric*, which speaks of the "north-side," whereas the  
'*Scotch Book*, drawn up in accordance with the Archbishop's  
'views, has "north-side or end": (3) That whereas, &c. (this  
'alludes to the '*Rails*,' which will be treated of presently)... (4)  
'That if we provoke puritanically-disposed Churchmen by intro-  
'ducing unauthorized and unfamiliar ornaments and ceremonies  
'about our *Altars*, they may be able to give us considerable trouble  
'by a reference to the authorities for the position of the *Table* at  
'times of Communion.' (p. 161).—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. A. J. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), commenting upon the expression 'the north-side of the Table', says—'It is clear that the *Table* must be moveable, and that the Ordinary can order it to be placed, during the Communion Service, to satisfy the language of the *Rubrics*. . . It is contended that if an *oblong Table* be used, then, as the *sides* are different in length from the ends, or 'head' and 'foot,' standing either at the head or foot of an oblong Table is not standing at either of its sides: and therefore, that, to satisfy the language of the *Rubric*, if an oblong Table be used the 'head' and 'foot' of the Table should be east and west, and then a north-side will be acquired. But this is in fact forgetting that no form of Table has been prescribed by the Statute, and therefore that it may be square, or of any other rectilinear figure, or even circular, where of course you cannot have any side, in the sense which it is contended 'side' here bears. The meaning of 'at the north-side' therefore seems really to be simply 'to the north' of the Table. Before A.B.P. LAUD's reforms, the *Holy-Table* being then as now generally oblong, was very commonly placed with the ends east and west; and it may be here observed that the Scotch Book of 1637, which was revised by LAUD under CHARLES's directions, has "north side or end". The *Rubrics* and the Canon of 1604 justify the removal of the *Holy Table* at Communion-time.' (p. 1125)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE states—'The *Communion-Table* was at first placed by the Reformers in the same situation which the *Stone-Altar* had occupied, attached to an eastern wall, which appears clearly to have been the English custom, whatever may have been that of foreign countries. This position gave great unbrage to the Puritans, and caused much altercation; during the period of their triumph under CROMWELL, the *Communion-Table* was placed in the middle of the Chancel, with seats all round it for the Communicants; at the Restoration it seems to have been almost universally replaced in its original position, but, in a few rare instances the Puritan arrangement was suffered to remain.' (p. 14.)—4th edit.

The QUARTERLY REVIEW makes a few observations on this subject, but they have been already quoted in page 416.

### *Communion Bread and Wine.*

Although the *Bread and Wine* for the 'Holy Communion' cannot be classed among the 'ORNAMENTS and GOODS of the Church' in the ordinary sense of those terms, inasmuch as they are perishable things, one of them at least from its nature requiring to be supplied fresh at every Administration of the Lord's Supper: yet they are '*goods*' to be provided at the cost of the Parish, and as such

may come under our notice while speaking of the things appertaining to the *Communion-Table*.

The CANONS of 1603-4, and *three* of the RUBRICS at the end of the 'Communion Office', furnish us with very important instructions on this matter: and the regulations imposed by the latter, having the force of Statute Law, are therefore of binding authority.

Both the CANON and RUBRIC are very careful to secure the due provision of proper and sufficient *Bread* and *Wine* by laying the responsibility on the '*Curate\* and Churchwardens*,' conjointly; directing at the same time that the expence shall be borne by the Parishioners at large.

The CANON runs as follows:—

'The CHURCHWARDENS of every Parish, against the time of 'every 'Communion,' shall at the charge of the Parish, with 'the advice and direction of the MINISTER, provide a *sufficient quantity of fine white Bread, and of good and wholesome Wine*, for the number of Communicants that shall from time 'to time receive there.'—CANON 20.

The *three* RUBRICS,—which we will quote out of the sequence in which they occur in the Liturgy, so as to follow the order of the injunctions laid down in the CANON,—refer.

- (a) To the *provision* of the BREAD and WINE.
- (b) To the *kind and quality* of the BREAD.
- (c) To the *disposal* of what remains of the BREAD and WINE after 'administration,' whether consecrated, or unconsecrated.

The RUBRIC, relating to the question of '*supply*' is the *seventh* of those to be found at the end of the Communion Office, and is as follows:—

(a.) ¶ '*The BREAD and WINE for the Communion shall be 'provided by the Curate and the Churchwardens at the Charges 'of the Parish.*'—(1662) Present B. of Com. Pr.

---

\* The term '*Curate*' adopted in this RUBRIC is to be taken in its widest acceptation, and implies '*he who has the Cure of Souls*,' whether he be the incumbent, or a Stipendiary Curate.



The RUBRIC prescribing the *kind and quality* of the BREAD stands the *fifth* in rotation; and thus reads—

(b.) ¶ ‘*And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath, or might have concerning the BREAD and WINE, it shall suffice that the BREAD be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten.*’—(1552—1662).—KEELING, 230, 231.

The other RUBRIC, giving instructions as to the *disposal* of the BREAD and WINE that may remain after ‘Communion’ is over, is the *sixth* in order, and reads thus:—

(c.) ¶ ‘*And if any of the BREAD and WINE remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.*’\*—(1662) Present B. of Com. Prayer.

The injunctions thus laid down in CANON 20, and the three RUBRICS above quoted, not only direct that a *sufficient quantity* of BREAD and WINE shall be provided, but that

(I) The BREAD shall be *fine white Bread*, such as is usually eaten, and made of the *best and purest wheat* that can be obtained.

(II) The WINE shall be ‘*good and wholesome.*’

They also prescribe the duties of (1) the Minister, (2) the Churchwardens, and (3) of the Parishioners in this especial matter.

(1) The MINISTER is to see that the *Churchwardens* against the time of every Communion provide good and proper *Bread* and

\* In the AMERICAN LITURGY the two Rubrics (a) (b), above quoted are omitted altogether; while the third Rubric (c) is without the commencing clause, and somewhat differently worded, thus:—

‘*And if any of the consecrated BREAD and WINE remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church; but the Minister and other Communicants shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.*’—DR. WAINWRIGHT’S ed. New York, 1845.

*Wine*, and in sufficient quantity: and he is permitted to take for his own use what remains unconsecrated.

(2) The CHURCHWARDENS are to supply at the Parish expence *Bread* and *Wine* of proper character and quantity; not, however, according to their own taste and discretion, nor such as the *Vestry* might think fit to impose, but, as the CANON says, 'with the advice and direction of the *Minister*': and if they refuse, they can be compelled by '*mandamus*' from the Court of Queen's Bench.

(3) The PARISHIONERS are bound to find the necessary funds; and those of them who are Communicants, and whom the MINISTER may select after the 'Administration', shall partake with him of the consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* that may remain.

Such are the strictly *legal* requirements affecting the provision and the disposal of the BREAD and WINE for the Holy Communion. We must now direct attention to the exceptions to these requirements, and other contingent circumstances arising out of custom and modern usage.

I. *Supply*.—Beginning with the question of *supply*, it will be found that in some places immemorial custom has imposed this duty upon the INCUMBENT, who therefore in such a case, cannot transfer the burden to the Parish. Yet in many instances, the Incumbent, under a feeling of reverence, will voluntarily undertake to furnish the necessary BREAD, leaving the *Wine* to be procured as usual by the Churchwardens. In small Parishes, such a charge may be undertaken by the Incumbent without inconvenience; but in large Parishes, it demands some consideration. In the primitive Church it was customary for the Bread and Wine to be provided from the voluntary oblations of the people, and the duty subsequently devolved on the Incumbent. In the original *Liturgy* (1549) the following RUBRIC confirms this practice; the minister however was indemnified by the offerings of the people: thus—

(*d.*) '*And forasmuch as the Pastors and Curates within this Realm, shall continually find at their costs and charges in*

‘their cures, sufficient BREAD and WINE for the Holy Communion, (as oft as their Parishioners shall be disposed for their spiritual comfort to receive the same,) it is therefore ordered, that in recompense of such costs and charges, the Parishioners of every Parish shall offer every Sunday, at the time of the Offertory, the just value and price of the holy loaf, (with all such money, and other things as were wont to be offered with the same) to the use of their Pastors and Curates, and that in such order and course, as they were wont to find and pay the said holy loaf.’ First Liturgy of Edward VI. A. D. 1549.—KEELING, 233.

In *Chapels* annexed to a Church the people were similarly required by another Rubric to find sufficient funds for the expences of the Holy Communion: thus—

(e.) ‘And in such *Chapels* annexed, where the People hath not been accustomed to pay any holy Bread, there they must either make some charitable provision for the bearing of the charges of the Communion, or else (for receiving of the same) resort to their Parish Church. (ibid.)

In the *Second Liturgy* of Edward VI. (1552) the first (d) of these two *Rubrics* last quoted was thus altered:—

(f.) ‘The Bread and Wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the Churchwardens, at the Charges of the Parish; and the Parish shall be discharged of such sums of money, or other duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of their houses every Sunday.’—KEELING, 231.

This *Rubric* continued in the same form in the LITURGIES of 1559, and 1604; but at the last Review in 1662 (our present Liturgy) only the first clause was retained, (KEELING 230, 231.); and in consequence the burden has generally fallen upon the Parishioners.

A reference to historical documents and other evidences will confirm all that has been advanced.

BISHOP COSINS (*ob.* 1671.) says:—‘There was a custom in the ancient Church for the faithful in the Assemblies to offer Bread and Wine, not only for the use of the Poor, but also for the sustenance of the Ministers of the Church, after there had been taken as much as sufficed for the Administration of the Eucharist. Which order and custom of the ancient Church, is acknowledged and approved by Bullinger, one of the Reformers in Switzerland. (Lib. iii. *de Orig. Err.* c. 4.)....Which is the reason that the Sentences appointed to be read for the Offertory, refer some to the Poor, and some to the Ministers of the Church, that wait

'upon the Altar. And this is also the reason, that in the fifth Rule following the Collects after the Offertory, it is appointed, '*If any of the Bread and Wine remain, the Curate shall have it home to his own house.*'... For it is but reasonable, that those who partake of the holy things, should offer or contribute something towards the providing what is necessary in order to them.... This custom of Offering continued long in the Church, which the second Synod of *Mascon*, towards the conclusion of the 6th century did confirm by the 4th Canon thereof.... Of the same Oblation, *Amnarius Fortunatus* in the 9th age makes mention in his *Eccles. Off.* lib. iii. c. 19.—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.* p. 41.

ARCHDEACON SHARP remarks, when comparing the above Rubric (a) and the Canon,—'The *Rubric* upon the same point is fuller and clearer than the Canon. For whereas it is only said in the latter, that the Churchwardens of every Parish, against the time of every Communion, shall at the charge of the Parish, provide a sufficient quantity of *Bread and Wine*, "with the advice and direction of the Minister"; the RUBRIC has it, that the Bread and Wine for the Communion shall be provided "by the Curate and the Churchwardens at the Charges of the Parish." But I fear neither CANON nor RUBRIC will prevail against custom and long usage, for the discharging any Parish Minister, who hath provided the Bread and Wine hitherto at his own cost, from that expence and burden: I mean for those *three Communion*s which he is bound to minister every year; that of Easter being one, and for which he is supposed to be entitled to some of his Easter Offerings or reckonings. We are told that this order, both in Canon and Rubric, is not to be understood to extend to any places where the provision of Bread and Wine was already settled by custom: which supposes composition.' (p. 100. note)—*Rubrics and Canons.* Charge A. D. 1739.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) observes:—'That the primitive Church always used *common Bread*, appears, in that the Elements for the holy Eucharist were always taken out of the People's Oblations of *Bread and Wine*, which doubtless were such as they themselves used upon other occasions. But when these oblations began to be left off about the 11th or 12th century, the Clergy were forced to provide the Elements themselves; and they under pretence of decency and respect, brought it from *leavened to unleavened*, and from a loaf of *common bread*, that might be broken, to a nice *wafer*, formed in the figure of a *denarius* or penny, to represent, as some imagine, the *thirty pence* for which our Saviour was sold. And then also the People, instead of offering a *loaf*, as formerly, were ordered to offer a penny, which was either to be given to the poor, or to be expended upon something belonging to the sacrifice of the Altar. (*BONA de Reb. Lit.* i. 23. 11; BINGHAM'S *Chr. Antiq.* xv. 2. §. 5, 6.)' p. 312.... 'How they were provided in the primitive Church I have already showed. Afterwards, it seems, it was the custom for every house in the Parish to provide in their turns the *holy loaf* (under which name I suppose were comprehended both the Elements of BREAD and WINE); and the *good Man* and *good Woman* that provided were particularly remembered in the Prayers of the Church. But by the *first* Book of king Edward the care of providing was thrown upon the Pastors and Curates....' (after quoting the *Rubrics* (d.) (e.) given

'above, he proceeds)... 'But now, since, from this method of providing, several unforeseen inconveniences might, and most probably did arise, either from the negligence, or obstinacy, or poverty of the Parishioners, it was therefore afterwards ordered that '*the Bread and Wine &c.*' (here follows the *Rubric* (f.) last quoted.) And this is the method the Church still uses; the former part of this *Rubric* being continued in our present Communion Office, though the latter part was left out, as having reference to 'a custom which had for a long while been forgotten.' (p. 315.)—*Rat. III. of B. of Com. Pr.*

Of more modern date we have the following writers :—

REV. W. PALMER says:—'The custom of offering voluntary Oblations was therefore universal in the primitive Church. These Oblations were of various sorts. Some offered money, vestments, and other precious gifts, and all it appears offered *Bread and Wine* from which the Elements of the Sacrament were taken.... In the West, the people offered *Bread and Wine* in the Public Assembly, immediately after the Catechumens were dismissed, and before the solemn prayers began. We have no authentic record of the prevalence of any such custom in the East (vol. ii. p. 68.).... In the Church of Milan, the custom of offering *Bread and Wine* is still in some degree preserved (ib. 69.).. When the people offered *Bread and Wine*, the Elements for the Sacrament were taken from their Oblations.' (ib. 71.)—*Orig. Lit.* (So BINGHAM, *Antiq. of Christian Ch.* xv. 2. §. 1.)

DR. BURN quotes the following:—'In the case of *Franklyn* and the *Master and Brethren of St Cross*, T. 1721. (Bunb. 79.). Although by the endowment the Vicar was to find the Sacrament *Wine*, yet the Court were of opinion it should be found by the Parishioners according to the CANON. It had been better to have said, according to the *Rubric*; which is established by Act of Parliament.'—*Ecol. L. Phil.* ii. 426. (quoted also in CRIPPS' *Laws Rel. to Cl.* 697.)

Such is the information we possess on this subject of '*provision*'; we now come to the discussion of the *kind* of BREAD, and of the *quality* of the WINE.

II. *Kind of BREAD.*—The *Rubric* imposes that the BREAD shall be that which is made of the best *wheaten flour*, and such as is generally eaten. This is decisive against the introduction of *mafer-bread*; and it determines the question long agitated, whether the Bread should be *leavened* or *unleavened*. RIDDLE (in his *Christian Antiq.* p. 587.) informs us that *leavened* Bread was adopted among the early Christians; but from the 7th century *unleavened* Bread was employed by the Latin Church, while the Greek Church still maintained the use of *leavened* Bread.

In the 11th century it grew into a matter of warm controversy (*ἀπομαχία*) between these two Churches; the Patriarch of Constantinople, MICHAEL CERULARIUS, having then (A. D. 1053.) taken upon himself to condemn the departure from the ancient practice adopted by the Latin Church: these, on the other hand, defended their usage, and held it to be a thing indifferent. The Protestants advocate generally the opinion of the latter Church, yet since the Reformation they have for the most part discontinued the use of *unleavened Bread*; although the Lutherans have retained it. Soon after the rise of this controversy with the Greek Church, the Sacramental Bread began to assume the form of little cakes, or *wafers*; but as they gradually became charged with superstition, they were prohibited, and the *Bread* of ordinary use enjoined.

In the Rubric of the *first LITURGY* of Edward VI. (1549) it was ordered:—

(g.) ‘*For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the BREAD prepared for the Communion be made through all this Realm after one sort and fashion: that is to say unleavened, and round as it was afore; but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces: and every one shall be divided in two pieces, at the least, or more, by the discretion of the Minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*’—KEELING, 233.

In the *Second LITURGY* of Edward VI. (1552), this Rubric was altered into the following form:—

(h.) ‘*And to take away the superstition, which any person hath, or might have in the BREAD and WINE, it shall suffice that the BREAD be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread, that conveniently may be gotten.*’—KEELING, 231.

But, in the reign of ELIZABETH, although this Rubric (of 1552) was preserved in the Liturgy of 1559, yet ‘to come up the closer,’ says HEYLYN, ‘to those of the Church of Rome, it was ordered by the Queen’s Injunctions that the Sacramental *Bread* (which the Book required only to be made of the finest flour) should be made round, in fashion of the *Wafers* used in the time of Queen MARY. (*Hist. of Ref. E. H. S.* II. 286.). The *Injunction* was thus worded:—

‘It was in the time of King Edward VI. used to have the Sacramental Bread of *common fine Bread*; it is ordered for the more reverence to be given to these holy mysteries being the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that the said Sacramental Bread be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion, round, though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness, as the usual bread and water, heretofore named *singing cakes*,

'which served for the use of the private mass.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 202.

According to the interpretation assigned to these Injunctions by the Bishops shortly after, 'the common bread' was implied; and 'that the common bread be thicker and broader than it is now commonly used.'—(*ib.* 205, 206.)

In 1569. ABP. PARKER in his Visitation Articles inquires:—'Whether they do use to minister the holy Communion in *wafer-bread* according to the Queen's Majestie's Injunctions, or els in *common bread*.'—(*ib.* 321.). He also says:—'It shall suffice I expound, where either there wanteth such fine bread, or superstition be feared in the *Wafer-bread*, they may have the Communion in usual bread; which is rather a toleration in these two necessities than a plain ordering, as in the Injunction.'—STRYPE'S *Parker*, 310.

In 1571, we find that *Wafer-bread* was used by the Reformers in foreign countries, for when ABP. GRINDAL urged the practice of Geneva in favour of the *Wafer*, the Puritans replied, that although *Wafer-bread* was used in Parish Churches at Geneva, yet the English congregation there did minister with loaf-bread.' STRYPE'S *Grindal*, p. 31. 117.—(quoted in ROBERTSON'S *How shall we conform to Lit.* p. 187; and in STEPHEN'S *B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 1234.)

In 1637. The *Rubric* of the SCOTCH LITURGY ran:—

- (i.) 'And to take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the BREAD and WINE, (though it be lawful to have *Wafer-bread*) it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual: yet the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.'—KEELING, 230.

In 1640. ABP. LAUD says—'I never either gave or received the Communion, but in ordinary bread. At Westminster I know (*Wafer-bread*) was sometimes used, but as a thing indifferent.'—(*Troubles*, 342.)

Our present RUBRIC (1662) says—'It shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best' &c. (See *Rubric* (b) above quoted.)

BP. COSINS (*ob.* 1671.) remarks on our Rubric of 1662:—'It is not here commanded, that no *unleavened* or *Wafer-Bread* be used, but it is said only, that the other Bread shall suffice; so that though there was no necessity, yet there was a liberty still reserved of using *Wafer-bread*, which was continued in divers churches of the kingdom, and Westminster for one, till the 17th of King CHARLES. The use of common bread was begun by *Farel*, and *Viret* at Geneva 1538, which so offended the people there, and their neighbours at Lausan and Bern (who had called a Synod about it) that both *Farel*, and *Viret*, and *Calvin* and all, were banished for it from the town, where afterwards the *Wafer-bread* being restored, *Calvin* thought fit to continue it, and so it is at this day. *Vid. Vitam Calvin per Bezam ad Au.* 1538, et *Ep. Calv.*'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.* p. 54.

NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712.) says—‘This Rubric is set down in opposition to the practice of the Roman and Greek Churches in late ages to use *Wafers*. For it is certain that our Saviour, in delivering the Sacrament to His disciples used the *common bread*. And there is no trace in antiquity of *Wafers* being used till the 11th century. We meet with them indeed in DURANDUS his *Rationale*, written about the year 1280. But they were not all stamped with Crucifixes as they are now. All of them, he says, were *formâ rotundâ*, ‘round like a Penny’; on some of them were printed ‘*forma et nomen Imperatoris nostri*,’ i. e. Christ’s image and name; others ‘*agnum figurare*,’ had the *Holy Lamb* upon them; but he allows the ancient custom to be otherwise (cap. 25.). HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, who lived towards the beginning of that century, in his Book ‘*De gemma animæ*’ mentions these ‘*in modum denarii formari*, to be made small like a Penny. This indeed had been in fashion in many places a good while before that time; but was opposed at the first coming in by wise men. BERTOLDUS CONSTANTIENSIS, who wrote his Book ‘*De Ordine Romano*,’ about the year 1077, saw this foolish custom of *Wafers* a creeping in his time, but speaks of them with a great deal of contempt, as very ridiculous things.... When our Reformation was first made, the Bishops thought fit to redress as much of this innovation as the times would then bear, and therefore in the first Book of Edward VI. it was ordered ‘*That the Bread*’ &c. (here follow the *Rubrics* of the LITURGIES of 1549, 1552, and 1662 as already quoted.)—*Com. Pr.* in loco. Further on when commenting on the *Catechism*, he adds:—‘The Holy Sacrament is not duly administered in the Church of Rome, where only Bread is administered to the Laity, our Saviour having appointed both Bread and Wine. Nor when BREAD is made of *superstitious ingredients*; nor in the form of *Wafers*, with Crucifixes, or other Pictures upon them, our Saviour having administered it with such Bread as was commonly eaten at Meals’.—*Com. Pr.* in loco.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742.) remarks—‘As to the *Bread*, some made it essential to the Sacrament to have *leavened*, others *unleavened*; each in that, as well as in other matters of as small moment, superstitiously making an indifferent thing a matter of conscience. Our Saviour doubtless used such Bread as was ready at hand: and therefore this Sacrament being instituted immediately after the celebration of the Passover, at which they were neither to eat *leavened* bread, nor so much as to have any in their houses, upon pain of being cut off from Israel (*Exod.* xii. 15. 19.), does perfectly demonstrate that he used that which was *unleavened*. But this perhaps was only upon the account of the Passover, when no other but *unleavened* bread could be used by the Jews. After His resurrection He probably celebrated (it He celebrated at all) in *leavened* bread, and such as was in common use at all other times except the time of the Passover. And that the primitive Church always used *common bread*,’ &c. &c. (*already quoted* in p. 554. where he speaks of the introduction of the *Wafers*; he then proceeds:—) ‘However, this abuse was complained of by some discerning and judicious men, as soon as it began. But when once introduced, it was so generally approved, that it was not easy to lay it aside. For even after the Reformation, King Edward’s first Book enjoins these *unleavened Wafers* to be used, though with a little alteration indeed in relation to their size.



'The whole *Rubric*, as it stood then, runs thus:—"For avoiding"  
'&c. (see (q) page 556.). 'The Bread I suppose was ordered to be  
'round, in imitation of the *Wafers* that had been used both in the  
'Greek and Roman Church ever since the 11th century (*Bertold*  
'*Const.* ; *Durand. Rat.*) upon which was stamped the figure either  
'of a Crucifix, or the Holy Lamh. But in the *Rubric* above, it is  
'ordered to be made "without all manner of print, and something  
'"more large and thicker than it was"; the custom before being  
'to make it small, about the size of a penny, to represent, as some  
'imagine, the thirty pence for which our Lord was sold. (HONOR.  
'*Gem. An.* ; BINGHAM, l. xv. c. 2. §. 5.). These superstitions the  
'Reformation had laid aside; but the *Rubric* above mentioned  
'still affording matter for scruple, it was altered at the Review in  
'the fifth of King Edward, when in his Second Book this *Rubric*  
'was inserted (see (k) page 556.). And the same *Rubric* with some  
'little difference is still continued in our present Liturgy. Though,  
'by the Injunction of Queen Elizabeth, *Wafers* seems to have  
'been again enjoined.' (The author, after quoting the *Injunction*  
(already given in page 556.) and the observations of BP. COSINS on  
our present *Rubric*, (see page 557.) concludes by referring to the  
parenthetical clause in the *Rubric* of the Scotch Liturgy, inserted,  
he says, 'to shew that the use of *Wafers* is lawful.' (p. 311—  
314.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

DR. HOOK defines *Wafers* as—"The Bread which is used in the  
'Eucharist by the Romanists, and by Lutheran Protestants in the  
'Lord's Supper....In the ancient Church, so long as the people  
'continued to make oblations of BREAD and WINE, the Elements  
'for the use of the Eucharist were usually taken out of them; and  
'consequently, so long the Bread was that common leavened  
'Bread which they used upon other occasions; and the use of  
'*wafers* and unleavened Bread, was not known in the Church  
'till the 11th or 12th centuries. This is now acknowledged by the  
'most learned writers of the Romish Communion. The School  
'divines, who maintain, that the primitive Church always conse-  
'crated in *unleavened* Bread, argue from hence, that we must  
'suppose they followed the example of our Saviour, who celebrated  
'His last Supper with *unleavened* Bread. But Ecclesiastical  
'History, and the writings of the ancient Fathers unanimously  
'testify the contrary....How the change in this matter was made,  
'and the exact time when, is not easily determined. Cardinal  
'Bona's conjecture seems probable enough, that it crept in upon  
'the people's leaving off to make their oblations in common  
'bread; which occasioned the Clergy to provide it themselves, and  
'they, under pretence of decency and respect, brought it from  
'*leaven* to *unleaven*, and from a *loaf* of common bread that might  
'be broken, to a nice and delicate *wafers* formed in the figure of a  
'*denarius*, or penny, to represent the pence, for which our  
'Saviour was betrayed: and then also the people, instead of  
'offering a *loaf* of bread, as formerly, were ordered to offer a  
'penny, which was either to be given to the poor, or to be ex-  
'pended upon something pertaining to the sacrifice of the Altar.'  
(He concludes with quoting the *Rubrics* of the two Prayer Books of  
Edward VI, *g. h.* and the Injunction of Elizabeth, which we have  
already given). — *Church Dict.* Art. 'WAFERS' (This is more  
fully related in BINGHAM's *Antiq. of Chr. Ch.* xv. 2. §. 5, 6.)

The REV. W. GILSON HUMPHRY, following the opinion of 'Wheatly, says:—'The *Bread* is to be such as is usually eaten, to 'exclude the use of *Wafers* of unleavened bread, which began 'to be introduced in the 11th century, and which in process of 'time it became usual to stamp with the crucifix.' (p. 262.)—*Hist. & Expl. of B. of Com. Pr.*

The REV. J. JEBB says:—'For some time after the Reformation, *Wafers* were used at the Communion (LAUD'S *Troubles*, 'c. 35. p. 340; HEYLYN'S *Laud*, l. ii. pt. 1.), as at Westminster 'Abbey, and Prince Charles's Chapel in Spain, in the time of ABP. 'LAUD. *Abp. Parker* prescribed their use in Colleges (*Life*. l. ii. 'c. xxii.). This custom is altogether obsolete; and the spirit of 'the Rubric would plainly forbid its revival; since that Rubric 'was framed in order to take away all occasion of dissension, and 'superstition, which any person might have. It is true, that the 'words are, "it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to 'be eaten:" but the rule of charity would now construe this 'permission into a restriction. It is essential that the People should 'recognize the Elements to be actual BREAD and WINE. The 'order of the Church, however, is now frequently transgressed in 'another way, utter disregard being had to the *quality* of the 'BREAD. Every thing in God's Service ought to be the most 'excellent of its kind, and the neglect shown in this particular in 'many Parish Churches as respects both the BREAD and WINE, is 'contrary not only to *Law*, but to the plainest dictates of religious 'reverence.' (p. 523.)—*Choral Service.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, observes:—'I do not know 'whether such bread (*wafers-bread*) be ever used at the present 'day; unless it have local tradition in its favour, the use would be 'a foolish superstition.' (p. 188.)—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) remarks:—'The order of 'the Church is frequently transgressed by an utter disregard 'being had to the *quality* of the Bread. Upon this point the 'Rubric is clear; the Bread must be leavened, and of "the best 'and purest wheat" that can be conveniently procured; and if the 'Curate and Churchwardens" provide any Bread but "wheat" 'Bread, and of any quality but the best that conveniently may be 'gotten, they will be guilty of a breach of the laws Ecclesiastical, 'and for which any Parishioner could have them punished. The 'reason that the Bread must be "leavened" is, that that kind of 'Bread is "such as is usual to be eaten:" and it may be remarked 'that although the Book of 1549 ordered that the Bread should be 'unleavened, as before, the Rubric of 1552 coincides with the 'present. The use of *unleavened* Bread would savour of Popery, 'though it is true the Council of Trent teaches, "Potest eucharistia 'et in fermentato pane confici." (*Catech.* ii. 4. 15.) The object of 'the Rubric in providing that the "Bread be such as is usual to 'be eaten" was to prevent the use of *wafers*.' (p. 1233.)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

*Preparation of the Bread.*—In this matter there is much diversity of practice: many Clergymen prepare the Bread by taking from the ordinary loaf

as many slices as may be necessary, cutting them completely through into the requisite dies; others only partly sever them so as they may be the more readily broken into a convenient form; a third party prefer the slices entire, and at the proper time break them indiscriminately into small multiform pieces; while an extreme section of the Clergy have introduced a kind of *wafer-bread*. The more prevailing method of preparing the Bread seems to be the *partly severing* of the slices into small dies so as to facilitate the 'breaking,' and preserve as nearly as possible an uniformity of size, and shape.

*Instruments* for cutting the Sacramental Bread have been latterly adopted from ancient usage, and may be recommended where they are constructed to secure a *partial* separation only, since a complete severance would prevent conformity to the Rubric, which cannot be answered by breaking merely *one* of the dies, as many imagine\*.

On this question we may quote the following opinions:—

NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712) says—'Before the use of *Wafers* was brought into the Church, *breaking* the Bread was used, as more agreeable to our Saviour's practice, and an apter representation of His sufferings. Hence those frequent expressions in use among the ancient Greek writers of *κλάσματα*, the broken pieces of the Bread, *μερίδες* the small parts or bits, &c.... This ancient usage of *breaking* the Bread, was first altered by the Greeks, who brought in a way of *cutting* it; for which purpose they provided an iron instrument called *λογχῆ*, or '*the Spear*,' being something like a chisel, with a long handle, by which they chopped a flat cake of Bread into pieces; hereby pretending to exhibit a representation of our Saviour's side being pierced by the soldiers' spear. (*Vid.* CABBASIL. *de Sac. Euch. in Bibl. Patr.*). But in the Church of Rome the *breaking* of the bread, in order to communicate it among the faithful, is quite vanished; the Priest only divides the sacrificial *Wafer* in a superstitious way, into three parts, which he eats up himself; but the *Wafers* which are delivered to the Communicants are all entire.'—*Com. Pr.* in loco.

---

\* Mr. Gilbert French of Bolton advertizes *Oak Trays*, and *Brass-backed knives*, made especially for this purpose; at the cost of about 10s. or 12s. Messrs Cox and Son of London have manufactured what they call a '*Sacramental Bread-cutter*' for dividing the Bread into equal pieces, at *half-a-guinea* complete.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) observes:—‘The Roman Church instead of *‘breaking* the Bread for the Communicants to partake of it, only *‘breaks a single Wafer* into three parts, (of which no one partakes) *‘for the sake of retaining a shadow at least of the ancient custom.* *‘They acknowledge, it is true, that this is an alteration from the* *‘primitive practice: but then they urge that they had good* *‘reasons for making it, viz. lest in breaking the Bread some dan-* *‘ger might happen of scattering or losing some of the crumbs or* *‘particles; as if Christ Himself could not have foreseen what* *‘angers might happen, or have given as prudent orders as the* *‘Pope, concerning His own institution.’* (p. 292.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

The REV. W. G. HUMPHRY, speaking of the *breaking* of the Bread, says—‘It has been discontinued in the Church of Rome, *‘since the substitution of Wafers for Bread; in the Eastern* *‘Churches the Bread is broken when the benediction or consecra-* *‘tion has been completed.’* (p. 253)—*Hist. and Explan. of B. of Com. Pr.*

The REV. W. PALMER says:—‘The *Bread* or *Loaf* which our Saviour used in celebrating the Sacrament was whole and unbroken; for he took Bread, and blessed it, and broke it. He did not break it before, but after, it was sanctified. The Apostle Paul proves the unity of Christians from the unity of that Bread of which they were all partakers: 1 *Cor.* x. 17. “For we, being many, are one Bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one Bread.” And accordingly it has always been the practice of the Christian Church to place the Bread on the Table whole and unbroken, and only to break and divide it into portions for distribution when it is consecrated. The Eastern Churches at the present day use *cakes of Bread*, which, in order that they may be easily broken, are pressed with some instrument when they are made, so as to be deeply indented with transverse lines. This in fact appears to have been a usual mode in which the Bread was prepared in the earliest ages. (BP. MIDDLETON on the *Greek Art.* ed. by ROSE, p. 183.). It is not essential to the validity of the Sacrament that the Bread should be whole and entire before consecration, and broken afterwards; but the universal practice of the Christian Church, derived from the Apostles and from Jesus Christ Himself, ought not to be infringed in this matter.’ In a *Note* the Author adds—‘It is not by any means uncanonical, or inconsistent with the practice of the Christian Church, to *prepare* the Bread before the Service begins, by making *partial* incisions; which, without passing entirely through it, render it easy to be broken and divided at the proper time, but which do not destroy its *unity*. This custom has, in fact, prevailed for a long time in the patriarchate of Constantinople and in all the east, as may be seen in the preparatory part of the Liturgy of Chrysostom, published by GOAR in the ‘*Rituale Græcum*.’ But to *divide the Bread completely* into small fragments, (as may possibly be done in some places from want of consideration and familiarity with Ecclesiastical Rites,) is a practice which cannot be justified, and which should be carefully avoided. When there were many Communicants, in primitive times, there were several *cakes* or *loaves*, in proportion to the number; and it took some time after the Consecration

'was finished, to break and divide them into pieces for distribution; so that in some Churches an *Anthem* was sung while the Bread was broken.'—*Orig. Lit.* ii. 77.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) observes:—'The *Rubric* has not provided that the "bread" shall be an "unbroken loaf," and if the "Curate and Churchwardens" were to provide a "broken loaf" of the best and purest wheat, they could not be punished under the Statute of Uniformity.' (p. 1235.)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

The HIERURGIA ANGLICANA quotes from NEALE'S *History of the Puritans*, (vol. ii. pp. 223, 224), an account of the Altar furniture of the Cathedral of Canterbury; and among which is "a knife to cut the Sacramental Bread."—(p. 21.).

The QUARTERLY REVIEW, after animadverting upon the introduction of a 'Credence-Table,' thus proceeds:—'In what shape are the Elements to be presented on the Credence-Table: is the Wine to be in a bottle, and the Bread in a loaf?' (The Reviewer here adds in a *Note*—'In old times the Parishioners, in turn, were hound to present the *holy-loaf*'. (Beveridge, *ubi supra*, p. 40.): 'which seems to have been done at the Offertory.'). 'Is the Minister, *coram populo*, to decant the Wine into the holy vessels, and to cut the Bread into such portions as may be convenient for the ulterior proceedings at the holy Table; or must that be still done by the profane hands of the Clerk, or Sexton? These and many such questions we have a right to put to men who disturb an ancient and established order on the plea of a strict interpretation of the Rubric.... The result of all is, that no form of words—no law, ecclesiastical or civil—can be so framed as to prevent question and doubt; and, therefore, the common sense of mankind seeks for and acquiesces in the interpretation of usage and precedent.' (Then follows in a *Note*—'The only real departure we have ever seen from what we think a fair execution of the Sacramental Rubric is one that these hypercritics have not, that we know of, hit on, namely—the *cutting up all the Bread into dies*, so that the *breaking* the Bread is a mere formality operated on one little piece. It seems to us that it would be better if the Bread were to be cut *not into dies*, but into *narrow slices*, from which the Minister could conveniently *break off* a small piece for each Communicant. We presume to suggest this, because, in this particular, the words of the Rubric are the sacramental words of the Gospel—took bread and BRAKE it.' (p. 266—267.).)—No. cxliii. May, 1843. (See under 'CREDESCENCE-TABLE,' *postea*).

We now pass to the consideration of the *Wine*.

WINE.—The only injunction in *Canon* or *Rubric* that bears upon the kind of WINE to be employed at the Holy Communion is, that it shall "*be good and wholesome*": and as there is no direction respecting its colour, it may be either *red* or *white* wine. That which is usually provided is the best *Rota Tent*.

Many Clergymen however prefer *Port Wine*: the latter is more expensive, but has the advantage of being more useful for distribution amongst the sick and infirm, where the unconsecrated portion that may remain is so devoted. There are not many Parishes so parsimonious, or call it frugal, as to question the Minister's right, conferred by the Rubric, to apply as he may think proper the remainder of the Wine removed from the Church after the Service, or to expect that this residue shall serve for the next 'Administration.' If the disputed portion of the Wine form no part of the oblations, it has been said that the Minister has no claim to it, and therefore its application depends on the discretion of the Churchwardens. If however it be brought into the Church it becomes an offering. It may be remarked here that the *Vestry* have no voice in directing either the quality of the WINE, or the quantity to be disbursed: these are questions of detail connected with the office of the Churchwarden, who is required in this particular by the *Rubric* to consult with the Minister.

With respect to the *colour* of the WINE we have the following opinions:—

The REV. J. E. RIDDLE remarks:—'It is probable that the WINE used by our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist was of a red or dark colour (See BOCHART. *Hieroz.* p. 1. l. ii. c. 12. BUXTORF. *Dissert. de Cæn. Dom.* Thes. 20; BYNÆI *De Morte Jesu Christi*, l. i. c. 8. §. 31.). In the Churches both of the East and the West the colour of the WINE has been treated as indifferent. A preference has been usually given to *red*, on account of its greater resemblance to that which it represents; but *white* Wine has been sometimes preferred, on account of its greater clearness and apparent purity. The use of *white* Wine prevails in the Greek Church, and in some Protestant Churches on the continent.\*—*Christian Antiq.* p. 590.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says:—'The *Rubric* has not prescribed whether the WINE shall be *red* wine, or *white* wine, and no proceedings could be instituted against the Churchwardens if they only supplied *white* Wine, or only supplied *red* Wine.'—*B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 1237.

---

\* SCHMID states that in his country, Southern Germany, *white* WINE is generally used, and that the *colour* is considered a matter of indifference. (*Lit. der. Chr.* i. 413.)

*Mixing Water with the Wine.*—It has been made a question by some Clergymen, particularly those who advocate a strict adherence to the Rubrics of the *First LITURGY* of Edward VI. (1549) with respect to the Ornaments of the Church &c., whether the admixture of a little “*water*” with the Sacramental *Wine* be not admissible. They rely on the Rubric following the Offertory Sentences in that First Service Book; the words are these :—

‘*And putting the WINE into the Chalice, or else in some fair or convenient Cup, prepared for that use, (if the Chalice will not serve,) putting thereto a little pure and clean Water: And &c.*’ (1549)—KEELING, 185.

But as this *Rubric* found no place in any subsequent Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and no allusion is made to this usage either in the *Canons*, or in the *Rubrics* of the present Liturgy, the adoption of the practice cannot be well defended, and is, in fact, considered *illegal*. For how is the *water* to be conveyed? in what vessel? and at whose cost? These are questions affecting the functions of the Churchwardens, not of the Minister.

A few opinions may be useful on this point.

BP. OVERALL'S *Chaplain* (cir. 1614—19.), in his comments on the *Catechism*, says :—‘For cheapness, of old some would have *‘milk &c.*, which was condemned by ancient Councils; and some *‘only water*, which Epiphanius says was the heresy of the Ebionites.... This were enough to free our Church from any heinous offence, though it uses not commonly to *mix water with Wine*, as the Church of Rome doth: and yet we must confess the custom is very ancient, consonant to the figures of the Old Testament which S. CYPRIAN (*Ep.* 3. l. 2.) reckons up; and of the New, where *Water* and *Blood* issued out of Christ's side; and agreeable (as there is great probability) to Christ's own practice, when He did first institute this holy Sacrament: for it is not so likely that He used *Wine* alone in His sacred Supper; both because it was the custom of the Jews, *diluere vinum*, as Prov. ix. *Bibite vinum quod miscui vobis*; and because all the Evangelists use the name of *‘Calix,’ quod nomen* (saith MALDONATE) *significat vinum conjunctum cum aqua, juxta Ritum*. The Ancient Liturgies are all for *Vinum cum aqua mixtum*\*.... Our Church forbids it not,

\* ‘So Justin Mart. Apol. 2; Iren. l. 4. c. 57. et l. 5. initio; Cypr. Ep. 3. l. 2. Ambr. l. 5. de Sacram. c. 1: Gennad. de Eccl. dogm. c. 57; patres Concil. Trullan. and many others. Vide ‘*Notas in Gennadium*’.—(ibid.).

‘for ought I know, and they that think fit may use it, as some most eminent among us do at this day; yet for the approbation of our most common practice, which is to consecrate *Wine alone without Water*, we have all this on our side; the Greeks did it, *Niceph. Callist. l. 118. c. 53: Innocent 3. l. 4. c. 32: Durand. l. 4. d. 12. q. 5: Lomb. l. 4. d. 11: Bonav. ibid. ‘neque est de necessitate Sacramenti,’* with *Aquinas, p. 3. q. 74. Ar. 7. Euch. c. 11: Bernard Ep. 69. Rah. Maurus de Euch. c. 11. et alii.*—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL’S C. Pr. p. 60.*

WHEATLY (*ob. 1742*) observes upon the RUBRIC of the First Liturgy enjoining the addition of *Water*—‘This was ordered in conformity to a very ancient and primitive practice, and with an eye perhaps to our Saviour’s institution. For the *Wine* among the Jews being very strong, it was generally their custom, as at their ordinary meals, so also at the Passover, to qualify it with *Water* (*R. Ob. de Bartenora, et Maimonides in Mish. de Benedic. c. 7. s. 5.*): and therefore since the Cup which our Saviour blessed was probably one of those which were prepared for that feast, (*LIGHTFOOT, HOOPE*), some have concluded that, at the time of the institution, He made use of *Wine* in which *water* had been mixed. But of this they can produce no certainty of proof.... So that we must not affirm that our Saviour’s Cup was certainly mixed, before we are assured whether the *Wine* which He had prepared for His last Passover was so. Our Saviour intimates, that what He had delivered to His Apostles was ‘the *fruit of the Vine*’.... (After discussing what may be implied in this expression as different from the *fruit of the tree*, the Author proceeds.) ‘If this distinction fail, I do not know that there is so much a hint given in Scripture, from whence we may judge whether the *Wine* used by our Saviour was *mixed* or *not*; which yet we might reasonably expect to have found, if our Lord had designed the mixture as essential. Though were it ever so clear, that the Cup was mixed; yet if it does not also appear that it was mixed with design, our Saviour’s practice would no more oblige us to mix it now, than it would that we should consecrate unleavened bread.... consequently since He made use of *Wine* that was mixed, only because He found it ready prepared, or at most because the strength of the *Wine* used in that country required it; therefore our Church thinks it not necessary to mix it with us, because we ordinarily drink it pure. But I say this upon supposition that it could be clearly proved that the Cup which our Saviour used was mixed; whereas I have shown that there is no intimation in Scripture about it. Nor do any of the first Fathers assert or mention it. ORIGEN (who is the first that speaks either one way or the other) says, that our Saviour administered in *Wine* unmixed: (*Hom. 12. in Hierom.*); which he would not sure have done, had there been any certain tradition, or so much as a general opinion to the contrary. We do not indeed deny, but that, before his time, the mixture was the general practice of the Church, (*JUST. MART. Apol. i. c. 85; IREN. l. 4. c. 57; l. 5. c. 2; CLEM. ALEX. Pæd. l. 2. c. 2.*): but then it is nowhere said, that this was done in conformity to our Saviour’s institution; but since the same *Wine*, perhaps, that was prepared for the Communion served also for the Love-Feasts (which in the first ages of the Church, were



'always held at the same time; (1 *Cor.* xi; *Jude* 12; *IGNAT. ad Smgr.* §. 8; *CLEM. ALEX. Pæd. l. 2. c. 1*; *TERTULL. Apol. c. 39*; *Const. Apol. l. 2. c. 28.*) *Water* might be mixed with it for what we know, to prevent those disorders, which, even in the Apostles' time, were apt to arise from their drinking of it to excess (1 *Cor.* xi.); or possibly it might be instituted as an emblem of the indissoluble union between Christ and His Church, as St Cyprian explains it (*Ad Cæcil. Ep.* 63.); or lastly, (as is asserted by some other of the ancients) to be more expressive and significant of that blood and water which flowed from our Saviour's side when He was pierced upon the cross, &c. &c. (*AMBR. de Sacr. l. 5. c. 1*; *GENNAD. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 75*; *THEOPH. in Johan. xix. 34*; *MARTIN BRACAR. Coll. Can. c. 55.*)... It must be confessed, that the mixture has, in all ages, been the general practice, and for that reason was enjoined, as has been noted above, to be continued in our own Church, by the first Reformers. And though in the next Review the order for it was omitted, yet the practice of it was continued in the King's Chapel Royal, all the time that Bp. Andrewes was Dean of it; who also in the form that he drew up for the consecration of a Church, &c. expressly directs and orders it to be used. (*SPARROW'S. Coll.* 395, 396.). How it came to be neglected in the Review of our Liturgy in King Edward's reign, I have not yet been able to discover. I am apt to suspect that it was thrown out upon some objection of Calvin or Bucer, who were no friends to any practice for its being ancient and catholic, if it did not happen to suit with their fancy or humour. But whatever may have been the cause of laying it aside, since there is no reason to believe it essential; and since every Church has liberty to determine for herself in things not essential; it must be an argument sure of a very indiscreet and over-hasty zeal, to urge the omission of it as a ground for separation.' (p. 273—276)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.* (See *BINGHAM'S Antiq. of Christian Ch.* xv. 2. §. 7.)

Of later date are the following opinions.

The BISHOP OF LONDON (*Dr. Blomfield*) mentions among other usages, 'the mixing of *water* with the *Wine* in the Chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs, if not all of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognized by our own Church, and they are, therefore, *not to be practised* by its Ministers.' (p. 51).—*Charge* 1842.

The late BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR, &c. (*Dr. Mant*) says:—'The Church gives no countenance to the mixing of *water* with the Sacramental *Wine*. Her authority for so doing, in King Edward VIth's First Book, was subsequently withheld, and has not been revived. To revive it now were a dangerous, unwise, and offensive innovation.' (p. 62).—*Horæ Lit.*

The REV. W. GOODE remarks:—'The practice was enjoined by the Prayer Book of 1549, and the order for it deliberately withdrawn in all the subsequent Books of Common Prayer. The withdrawal of the order amounts, in fact, to a direct prohibition of the practice, because it shews an intention to exclude it. And so some, at least, of our greatest divines have held. Thus, for instance, Bp. Jewel, in his reply to Harding, evidently treats

‘the practice as one not in use in our Church....so also our learned *Bp. Morton* classes it among “the false and novel rites of the Sacrament of the Eucharist”....I am quite aware that our pious and learned *Bp. Andrewes* approved of it, and practised it. And other inferior authorities might be quoted for its use. But individual examples of this kind cannot authorize what the law forbids. And this practice is, not only by the absence of any direction for its use, but also by the withdrawal of such direction existing in a former Prayer Book, by implication *prohibited*.’ (p. 88.).—*Cer. of Ch. of England*.

The REV. W. GILSON HUMPHRY observes:—‘As no direction is given respecting the WINE, the ancient and primitive custom of *mixing a little water* with it, though not usual, is *not forbidden*.’ (p. 263.).—*Hist. & Explan. of B. of Com. Prayer*.

The REV. W. PALMER writes:—‘The custom of mingling *water* with the *Wine* of the Eucharist, is one which prevailed universally in the Christian Church from the earliest period. *Justin Martyr* of Syria, *Irenæus* of Gaul, *Clemens* of Alexandria, and *Cyprian* of Carthage, bear testimony to its prevalence in the 2nd and 3d centuries. (*Just. Apol.* l. p. 95, 96; *S. Iren.* l. v. c. 2. p. 294; *Clem. Alex. Pæd.* l. II. c. 2. p. 177; *Cypr.* Ep. 63. p. 148). There is, in fact, no sort of reason to deny that the Apostles themselves had the same custom. It is even probable that the Cup which our Saviour blessed at the last Supper contained *water* as well as *wine*, since it appears that it was generally the practice of the Jews to mix the Paschal Cup, which our Saviour used in instituting the Sacrament of his blood. (*Maimonides. de Solen. Pasch.* c. 7.). It has, however, long been decided by Theologians, that the *mixture of water* is not essential to the validity of the Sacrament. *Bona*, presbyter cardinal of Rome, refers to Bernard as speaking of some persons who thought that water was essential; “but,” he adds, “the judgment of Theologians is certain, that consecration is valid, even if water be omitted, though he who omits it is guilty of a serious offence.” (*Bona, Rer. Lit. l. II. c. 9. §. 3.*). The Arminians were the first Christians who prohibited the *mixture of water* with the *wine*; but they were condemned for this in the Council of Trullo, A. D. 691. as their objection arose from their heresy concerning the nature of Christ....In the *Church of England*, the *Wine* of the Eucharist was always, no doubt, mixed with water. In the Canons of the Anglo-Saxon Church, published in the time of King Edgar, it is enjoined, that, “no Priest shall celebrate the Liturgy unless he have all things which pertain to the holy Eucharist, that is, a pure oblation, pure *Wine*, and pure *Water*.” (*Wilkin's Conc. I. 227.*). In after ages we find no Canons made to enforce the use of *water*, for it was an established custom. Certainly none can be more conformable to the Canons and practice of the primitive Church. In the English it has never been actually prohibited; for the *Rubric* which enjoins the Priest to place Bread and *Wine* on the Table, does not prohibit him from mingling *water* with that *Wine*; and accordingly we find that *Bp. Andrewes*, *Abp. Laud*, and others have practised it. But as this rite was removed from the Ritual of the English Church by authority, together with several other rites, probably from a wish to simplify the administration of the Sacraments, and not from any intention to

'condemn the practice, and as it undoubtedly does not affect the validity of the Sacrament, its revival by individuals cannot be recommended.'—*Orig. Lit.* II. 75.

THE REV. J. E. RIDDLE says:—'It was the universal practice of the early Church to *minge water* with the Sacramental Wine. This mixture was called *κράμα* (mixtum, temperatum); which we find first in the writings of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, and frequently in authors of later date....Cyprian and Augustine speak of this mixing of water with the wine as an express precept of Christ....Many early writers, both Greek and Latin, and various Councils, appeal to the institution itself as a sufficient warrant for the practice....The Council of Trent speaks of this practice as enjoined by Ecclesiastical Law, but not by Divine command. (*Sess.* 22. c. 7; cf. c. 9.). It unquestionably received the sanction of the Church during many ages....At the Reformation, Protestants agreed in abandoning this ancient practice of the Church, not as being unlawful or inexpedient in itself, but because Roman Catholics declared it necessary, on the ground of mere Ecclesiastical (i. e. human) authority. They refused, in this respect, as well as in others, to acknowledge any Laws not contained in Scripture as binding upon the conscience. It has usually been taken for granted that the Wine used at the Passover was mixed with water; but it appears, from testimonies collected by Buxtorf, Schöttgen, and Lightfoot, that this was not necessarily the case. The *proportion of water mixed with wine*, by those who adhere to the ancient practice, is very small. In the Western Church a *third part* of water is the largest quantity allowed, but a *few drops* in the Cup are deemed sufficient.\* In the Western Church the mixture of (*cold*) water takes place only once, before the consecration, Wine being first poured into the Cup, and the Water added. But in the Oriental Church a two-fold mixing takes place. There is the first mixture of cold water in the Cup before consecration, and then a *second mixture* of warm Water, after consecration, and immediately before distribution. This is said to have been designed to represent at once the Water which flowed from our Saviour's side, and the fire of the Holy Spirit.' (See JAC. GOARI *Eucholog. Gr. ad missam* Chrysost. n. 67; ARCUDII *Concord.* III. 39; Conf. THOM. AQUIN. *Summa*. P. 3. Quæst. 83. Art. 6; BONA *Rer. Lit.* II. c. 9. § 4.).—*Christian Antig.* p. 590.

THE REV. J. C. ROBERTSON remarks:—'The mixture of the Cup is no more forbidden in our Church at this day than in the times of Andrewes and Laud, (see PALMER *Orig.* II. 76. and BP. JOLLY *on the Euch.*); but it would be extremely unwise in any Clergyman to introduce it now, unless he thought it necessary; and any one who should entertain that opinion would hardly be fit to hold office in the Anglican Church.'—(In a note

---

\* The *Sarum Missal* declares:—'Apponitur aqua solum ad significandum, sed una gutta tantum significat quantum mille.' (*fol.* CXXXIV.).

is added:—‘Nor, indeed in the Roman.’) ‘It must not however be supposed that I presume to censure those Clergymen who *temper the WINE* at early Communion, lest the receivers should not be able to hear its strength.’ (p. 189.)—*How Shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says:—‘Controversies have however arisen, whether, under the present Statute of Uniformity, a Priest can, contrary to the present general practice, in the administration of the Lord’s Supper, *mix Water with the Wine*. . . . Can any person question, that “Wine” is according to ordinary and familiar signification and import, a liquid *unmixed with Water*; or, in other words, the juice of the Vine. Besides, all the Furniture of the Holy Table, except the Bread and Wine (which are to be provided by the Curate and Churchwardens), can only be legally provided by the Churchwardens. The question then arises, can the Churchwardens be compelled to supply “Water?” It is, however, clear that they could not be compelled, because they are not required to provide “Water” by the Statute of Uniformity. It should also be remarked that in the office for the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper there is no allusion to “Water,” nor in any part of the Book of Common Prayer, any allusion to any “vessel” for holding the Water. Mr. Palmer considers that because a thing is not expressly forbidden or prohibited in a statute, it is *legal*; but “*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*,” and it is an acknowledged principle of law, that in a statute the intentions of the Legislature are not to be presumed, but are to be collected from its words: thus, certain “Ornaments of the Church” are mentioned in the Statute of Uniformity, and the legal inference is, that no other Ornaments were intended to be used except such as were expressly mentioned. . . . Under these circumstances, it seems to the Editor, with all due deference to Mr. Palmer, that *mixing “Water” with the “Wine” is illegal.*’ (p. 1236.)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

*Placing the Bread and Wine.*—It is still a common practice, for the *Churchwardens*, or *Clerk*, sometimes even the *Sexton*, to place the BREAD and WINE on the Communion-Table before the commencement of Divine Service, though recently it has been strongly censured. A custom less open to objection is for the *Officiating Minister* to take the Elements from the hands of the Churchwarden, Clerk, or other fit person, or from some convenient and contiguous spot, at the time appointed, and place them *himself* upon the Table. In some Churches, it is the usage, although a departure from the strict letter of the Rubric, for the Clergyman, while the non-Communicants are retiring before the Offertory, to proceed to the Vestry, and bringing the Elements,

then to deposit them on the Table. Where a *Side-Table* (see 'CREDENCE-TABLE' *postea*.) exists, the Bread and Wine are frequently placed upon it before the beginning of the Service, whence at the time enjoined by the Rubric they are removed by the Officiating Minister to the Communion-Table.

The *Rubric* giving us instructions in this matter was introduced at the last Review (1662), and immediately precedes the Prayer for the Church Militant, thus :—

¶ '*And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much BREAD and WINE, as he shall think sufficient.*' (1662)— (present Book of Common Prayer.)

Here we have the *person* defined, the *time* appointed, and the *place* prescribed : so that, according to the Rubric, for any one but the Officiating Minister to convey the Elements to the Table would be improper ; and to place them there before the Service, incorrect. In the First Liturgy of Edward VI the *Rubric* followed the Offertory Sentences, and read :—

1549.—'*Then shall the Minister take so much BREAD and WINE as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion, laying the BREAD upon the Corporas, or else in the Paten, or in some other comely thing, prepared for that purpose ; and putting the WINE into the Chalice, or else in some fair or convenient Cup, prepared for that use (if the Chalice will not serve) putting thereto a little pure and clean WATER : And setting both the BREAD and WINE upon the Altar.*'—KEELING. 185.

In the subsequent LITURGIES of 1552, 1559, and 1604, this *Rubric* was omitted, but it was to some extent revived in the SCOTCH LITURGY of 1637 ; from whence it was transferred with some slight alterations into our present Book of Common Prayer at the Revision in 1662 : but in the mean time various practices had arisen. In some places the Officiating Minister placed the Elements on the Table, in others the Churchwardens, or Clerk, or Sexton.

In the SCOTCH LITURGY the *Rubric* ran :—

1637.—'*And the Presbyter shall then offer up and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that Service.*'—KEELING, 186.

In 1636. BP. WREN, in his orders and directions given in the diocese of Norwich, enjoins—'That no *wicker bottles*, or *tavern pots* be brought unto the Communion-Table, and that the BREAD 'be brought in a clean cloth or *Napkin*.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* ii. 205.

In 1641. It was charged against the Laudian divines in the Committee of the House of Lords as an Innovation:—'Offering of BREAD and WINE by the hand of the Churchwardens 'or others before the consecration of the Elements.'—CARDWELL'S *Conf.* p. 273.

In 1708. BP. BULL, as we read in his Life, 'always placed the 'Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* upon the Altar himself, after he had 'received them from the Churchwarden, or Clerk, or had taken 'them from some convenient place where they had been laid for 'that purpose.'—(*Life*, p. 53.)

NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712), commenting upon the *Rubric*, says:—'The 'rule our Church here lays down (if it were duly observed) keeps a 'just mien between a careless disregard shewn to the Elements, and 'a pompous and ceremonious offering up of them as a *true* and '*proper sacrifice*. It is certain that our Church orders them to be 'placed upon the Table by the *Priest*, and by the connection 'which seems to be between this and the former *Rubric* it ought to 'be *humbly presented and placed*; for it is not to be thought that 'the *Alms* for the Poor should be presented with greater reverence 'than the *Bread* and *Wine*, which are brought thither for so 'divine a use. Therefore I cannot imagine, how so bold an innovation has obtained, for the *Bread* and *Wine* to be placed on the 'Lord's Table by *Churchwardens*, *Clerks*, *Sextons*, or any body, 'besides the Person whom the Church has obliged to do it'. . . . (After referring to the Prayers offered up at this proceeding in the Latin and Greek Churches, he proceeds). 'Now tho' our Church 'has not ordered any particular Prayer for this action of the Priest, 'he ought not to neglect the action itself, which he is enjoined to 'do, nor suffer it to be done by any other. And since the *Rubric* 'has not authorized the setting up a *Side-Table*, the Priest must be 'content either himself to go into the *Vestry* to fetch the Elements, 'or he must receive them at the hands of his *Deacon*, or *Clerk*, and 'then place them upon the Table; for place them there he must, 'and no one else, tho' it be not said where they are to be set, 'before they are so placed.'—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742.) states:—'In the ancient Church, they had 'generally a *Side-Table* near the Altar upon which the Elements were 'laid till the first part of the Communion Service was over, at which 'the Catechumens were allowed to be present; but when they 'were gone the Elements were removed and placed upon the holy 'Altar itself, with a solemn prayer. (*Lit. Chrys.*)—Now though we 'have no *Side-Table* authorized by our Church; yet in the first 'Common Prayer Book of King Edward VI. the *Priest himself* 'was ordered in this place (*after the Offertory*) to set both the 'BREAD and WINE upon the Altar (see the *Rubric* p. 571.): but 'at the Review in 1551, this and several other such ancient usages 'were thrown out, I suppose, at the instance of Bucer and Martyr. 'After which the *Scotch Liturgy* was the first wherein we find it 'restored: (see page 571.). . . . And Mr. Mede, having observed our

'own Liturgy to be defective in this particular, was probably the occasion, that, in the Review of it after the Restoration, this primitive practice was restored, and the BREAD and WINE ordered by the Rubric to be set solemnly upon the Table by the Priest himself. From whence, it appears, that the placing the Elements upon the Lord's Table, before the beginning of Morning Prayer, by the hands of a Clerk or Sexton, (as is now the general practice), is a profane and shameful breach of the aforesaid Rubric; and consequently that it is the duty of every Minister to prevent it for the future, and reverently to place the BREAD and WINE himself upon the Table, immediately after he has placed the Alms.' (p. 272.).—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

SHEPHERD (*ob.* 1805) observes in respect of this Rubric:—'The order that the Priest, and no other, shall place the BREAD and WINE upon the Table, and that he shall then do it, is positive; and it is, ordinarily speaking, capable of being complied with by every person, who has the honour to stand ministering at the Lord's Table.'—*Eluc. of B. of Com. Pr.* Vol. II. p. 196. (This remark seems to be derived almost verbatim from ARCHDEACON SHARP's work on the Rubrics and Canons, p. 57. *Charge* 1735.)

DR. HOOK, referring to the Rubric directing the Bread and Wine to be placed on the Table by the Priest himself, says:—'If the Priest neglects to do this, and thus offends the consciences of the more enlightened members of a Congregation, they should point out to him his mistake, which can only proceed from traditional negligence, a tradition not older than the middle of the last century. It is not to be supposed that any Priest would wilfully violate his vow of conformity, especially in so very solemn a Service. The return to these usages is not always easy, but it may be made easy by the fidelity of Churchwardens, for no Clergyman will like to be twice presented as unmindful of his solemn vow.'—*Church Dict.* Art. 'ELEMENTS.'

THE REV. J. C. ROBERTSON writes:—'The custom of suffering the Elements to be placed on the holy Table by any other hands than the Priest's, and at any other time than that which is appointed, is a transgression of the Rubric in spirit as well as in the letter.' (p. 202.).—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) observes:—'Whenever the Communion Service is read, and there is a congregation of three persons, exclusive of the Priest, desirous to receive the Sacrament, the Priest is obliged by law, himself to place upon the holy Table the BREAD and WINE prepared for the holy Sacrament, immediately after the Alms for the Poor and other devotions of the people have been placed there. It is indisputable that the placing of the sacred Elements upon the holy Table, before the beginning of Morning Prayer, and by the hands of a Clerk is illegal; although such is a common practice.' (p. 1171.).—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, after quoting the Rubric, and animadverting upon the comment of WHEATLY which we have given above (p. 572.), thus remarks:—'Wheatly wrote this above 100 years ago; but notwithstanding his warmth, and his authority, which is highly respectable, the old practice has continued. We

‘venture to think, with good reasons: the Clergy no doubt observed, first, the difficulty before noticed—that this placing of the *Bread* and *Wine* is always to be done immediately before the Church Militant Prayer—but the Church Militant Prayer is to be said sometimes when there is no Communion,—therefore the Elements are to be placed on the holy Table when there is no Communion. This, with all submission to Bp. BEVERIDGE, seems to us a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*, and are we to wonder that the Clergy did not adopt a manifest absurdity? But suppose that difficulty surmounted, and that they were to proceed to a literal execution of the Rubric—they find that it does not say *where* the BREAD and WINE are to be previously deposited, nor how the Priest is to get at them to place them on the Table; that, moreover, however they may be placed on the Table, they must be brought into the Priest’s reach by a *Clerk* or *Sexton*, and must arrive at the Church by even still less orderly hands; and it was conceived, not unjustly, we think, that the having the Elements on the Table, covered from sight with a fair linen cloth, was the most reverential mode of bringing them within the reach of the Minister, and that the *uncovering* and bringing them forward at the proper time was a more decent fulfilment of the Rubric than could be otherwise attained. The *innovators*, however, profess to adhere to the Rubric; and in their adherence the first thing they do is to fall into two very different and discordant processes. In some of their Churches, as we are informed, the Elements are placed in the *Vestry*, and the Minister, after the Offertory, proceeds to the *Vestry*, and brings them forth and places them on the Altar. This is easy enough to write or read, but look at it practically. The *Vestry* may be, and generally is, at some distance from the Table, which, therefore, the Minister must quit, and proceed to the *Vestry*, and make as many trips backwards and forwards as may be necessary to enable him to carry, not only the Elements themselves, but the ‘*Cups, Chalices, and Flagons*,’ and ‘the *Corporas*, or the *Paten*,’ or other comely thing’ in which they are to be placed. We need do no more than hint at the many unseemly accidents to which this process would be liable, and to express our decided opinion that the *present usage* is far preferable, and quite as Rubrical; for the Rubric says nothing of this parading up and down the Church, but indeed seems tacitly\* to forbid the Minister’s leaving the Table when he has returned to it after the Sermon. But the ‘other mode’ &c. (continued under ‘*Credence-Table*’ see *infra*).—No. CXLIII. *Moy* 1843, p. 265.

### III. What Remains of the BREAD and WINE brought into the Church at the time of the Commu-

---

\* The REVIEWER adds here in a *Note*:—‘The old Canons expressly forbid any kind of *procession about the Church*’: and ‘certainly this proceeding would have very much the air of the *Corpus Christi* procession.’



nion, and which by such act become portions of the Offerings of the People, is assigned by the Rubric, if *unconsecrated*, to the Curate's own use. He may therefore do with it as he pleases. (see *supra* p. 551.)

BP. COSINS (*ob.* 1671) considers this direction of the Rubric, — 'to be understood of that BREAD and WINE that the Churchwardens provided and carried into the Vestry, and not of that which the Priest consecrated for the Sacrament; for of this, if he be careful as he ought to be, to consecrate no more than will suffice to be distributed unto the Communicants, none will remain: yet if for lack of care they consecrate more than they distribute, why may not the Curates have it to their own use, as well as be given to children (*Conc. Martise. c. 2.*), or be burnt in the fire (*Hesych. in Levit.*), for though the BREAD and WINE remain, yet the consecration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ do not remain, longer than the holy action itself remains, for which the BREAD and WINE were hallowed; and which being ended, return to their former use again.'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.* p. 40. 54.

NICHOLLS says:— 'In the primitive times the BREAD and WINE designed for the consecration, were a part of the Offerings, which the Clergy likewise had a share in; therefore our Church has restored the remaining part of them to the ancient proprietors thereof by ordering the Curate to have it to his own use. And this is no more than what was in particular enjoined by the old Canons of the Church. *Const. Apol. VIII. c. 31.*'—*Book of Com. Pr.* *iu loco.*

WHEATLY remarks on this question:— 'Though it hath not been actually consecrated, yet by its being dedicated and offered to God, it ceases to be common, and therefore properly belongs to the Minister as God's steward.' (p. 314.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

What remains of the 'consecrated' BREAD and WINE, the Rubric directs shall not be taken out of the Church, but is to be consumed by the Priest, and those of the Communicants he may select.

BP. OVERALL'S *Chaplain* (cir. 1614—19), speaking of what remains of the consecrated BREAD and WINE, says:— 'It were but a profanation of the holy Sacrament, to let the Curate have it to his own use. . . . There was order taken for it of old in the Church, which were well to be observed still, that no more should be brought, at least consecrated upon the Altar, than would suffice to communicate the people; and if any remained, that the Priest should reverently receive it. . . . *quod remanserit (nempe ex holocaustis et elementis consecratis) non servetur in crastinum, sed cum timore et tremore Clericorum diligentia consumetur.* CLEM. P. P. 'Ep. 2.'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.* p. 54.

BP. COSINS says:— 'We read in *Clemens*, that after the Communion was done, the Deacons took up that which was left, and carried it into the *Pastophorium*, the room where the Priests

'were lodged. In *Origen*, that it was kept till the next day. In *S. Jerome*, that, after the Communion, they that had eaten it in the Church, spent all that remained of the oblations. In *Hesychius*, that, after the example of the old law, all that was left was cast into the fire. In *Evagrius*, that it was an ancient custom at Constantinople, that if any of the Sacrament remained, young children were called from the school to eat it up; which was retained in France, as in *Conc. Matic. et Turon.* held under 'Charlemain.'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S Com. Pr.* p. 54.

NICHOLLS, after speaking of the superstitious abuses which arose from a reservation of the Elements, concludes thus:—'Because these abuses have happened, and may again, by the reservation of the Elements, our Church has prudently ordered, that as for what remains thereof, *the Minister, and the Communicants shall reverently eat and drink the same.* And though the Council of Trent, Canon VII. out of their tenderness, do excommunicate us for it, yet we have the ancient Canons of the Church of our side: "*As to what is consecrated out of the Offering, let the Clergy distribute, and let not a Catechumen eat or drink of them, but rather the Clergy and the faithful brethren who communicate with them.*" Can. VII. Theoph. Alex. apud Basil.'—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco.

WHEATLY observes:—'In the primitive Church, whatever of the consecrated Elements were left after all had communicated, were either reserved by the Priest to be administered to infirm persons in cases of exigency, that they might not die without receiving the blessed Sacrament (EUSEB. *Ecc. H.* l. vii. c. 44. *C. Excerpt. Egbert.* 22. *Conc.* tom. vi. Col. 1588.); or else were sent about to absent friends, as pledges and tokens of love, and agreement in the unity of the same faith (JUST. MART. *Apol.* I. c. 85; EUSEB. *Ecc. H.* l. v. c. 24.). But this custom being abused, was afterwards prohibited by the Council of Laodicea (*Can.* 14.), and then the remains began to be divided among the Clergy (*Const. Apol.* l. VIII. c. 31.); and sometimes the other communicants were allowed to partake with them (*Theoph. Alex.* Can. VII.), as is now usual in our Church, where care is taken to prevent the superstitious reservation of them formerly practised by the Papists. However, it would be convenient if the Scotch Rubric were observed, by which, *to the end there may be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least.*' (p. 314.)—*Rat. Ill. of Book of Com. Pr.*

### *Communion-Cloths, &c.*

The *Cloths* or *Coverings* which appertain to the COMMUNION-TABLE are three in number. They are prescribed by the RUBRICS and CANONS of our Church; and are to be provided by the Churchwardens at the cost of the Parish. They may be thus enumerated:

I. The Covering of the Table at Communion-time—‘*a Fair white Linen Cloth*’. (RUBR. & CAN.)

II. The Covering of the Communion-Table during the other hours of Divine Service, often designated the ALTAR-CLOTH—‘*a Carpet of Silk, or other decent stuff*’. (CAN.)

III. The NAPKIN, or ‘*Fair Linen Cloth*.’ (RUBR.)

The RUBRICS speak only of the *first* and *third* of these Cloths; the CANON refers only to the *first* and *second*.

At the beginning of the ‘Communion Office’ we find four RUBRICS, the last of which directs—

¶ ‘*The TABLE at the Communion-time, having a fair white Linen Cloth upon it, shall stand, &c.*—(1552—1662.)  
KEELING. 166, 167.

\* \* This Rubric has been handed down to us unaltered from the *Second Liturgy* of Edward VI. 1552, and is confirmed by the 82nd CANON.

The NAPKIN, which is a Linen Cloth of smaller dimensions than the Covering of the Communion-Table, is required by a specific RUBRIC to be placed over the consecrated Elements, which remain after all have communicated, (‘*covering the same with a fair linen Cloth*.’ Rubr.); but as this will receive a separate notice, we will proceed to quote the CANON defining the Coverings of the Table, before we discuss the general subject.

The CANON, after ordering that decent COMMUNION-TABLES shall be provided, thus proceeds with regard to their Coverings:—

‘We appoint that the same *Tables* shall....be covered in time of Divine Service, with a *Carpet of silk or other decent stuff*, thought meet by the Ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it; and with a *fair Linen Cloth* at the time of the Ministration, as becometh that Table....All these to be done at the charge of the Parish.’—CANON 82.

Here we have the two Coverings specified, the authority of the Ordinary defined, and the liability of

providing and repairing them laid on the Parish. But this CANON is the only injunction in force which requires that the COMMUNION-TABLE shall be covered with what is frequently termed the *Altar-Cloth*. The instructions afforded us, however, by the RUBRIC and CANON above quoted, with respect to these two Coverings, are very loose and indefinite; so much so indeed as to leave the style and character of the Coverings of the Communion-Table, especially the *Altar-Cloth*, subjected to the extremes of undue and inordinate sumptuousness, and parsimonious meanness. It is not indeed from Churchwardens, that extravagance in the former direction is commonly to be apprehended; their error might rather be looked for in the latter. Wherever costliness or profusion of embellishment is introduced into Church Ornaments, it is for the most part due to the taste and munificence of the Clergyman, or of individual members of the congregation. From these sources have been supplied such sumptuous decorations for the Communion-Table as are not now uncommon; Altar Cloths of rich velvet or silk, with emblematic ornaments, such as the Evangelistic symbols, the monogram of the Holy Name, crosses, crowns, &c. in needlework or gold brocade. It is but charitable to regard such gifts to the Church, as proceeding from affection to her services, and a desire to show grateful honour to God in offering the choicest for His worship. And looked upon in this light, there is nothing surely that should excite censure or dislike. It is only when a zeal for Church decoration is accompanied by a course of conduct and teaching, that indicate a tendency inconsistent with Protestant Faith, that it justly falls under suspicion and dislike, as the index of extreme opinions, and ulterior views. Should peculiar circumstances cause unusual decoration of the Church to be regarded with distrust and disfavour by even a portion of the congregation, Christian wisdom will at once suggest the propriety of forbearing the indulgence of such a taste, however innocent in itself, until a change of sentiment on the

part of the objectors shall have freed its exercise from the liability of giving offence, or rendering persons uneasy in their place of worship. In case, however, any difference of opinion in regard to Church embellishment should arise between the Minister and the people, a ready mode of solving the difficulty is provided by the 82d Canon, by which a protracted dispute, with all its attendant evils, may be avoided. It expressly enjoins that if, in providing a Communion Cloth, '*any question be made of it*', recourse must be had to the Ordinary, for it is to be such a *Covering* as shall be '*thought meet by the Ordinary of the place.*'

It will therefore be prudent for a Clergyman, before he volunteers the gift of one or other of the Communion-Table *Coverings*, designed and executed after his own taste, to ascertain the feelings of the Churchwardens and Congregation on the subject, and to secure, as far as is practicable, their unanimous approval. This will preclude officious interference or unpleasantness afterwards. For it must be remembered that Churchwardens possess an indisputable right, vested in them by the CANON, to impose their *veto* upon the introduction of any Ornaments into the Church, which have not received their approbation. It is one of the *legal* functions of their office, not of that of the Incumbent, or of the Parishioners, to provide what may be requisite for the conduct of Divine Service: and for the propriety of the Goods and Ornaments they supply the Churchwardens are responsible to the Ordinary alone: and for any dereliction of this their duty, they are amenable to the censure and monition of the Ecclesiastical Court. (See *opinion* of BP. OF EXETER quoted in p. 480.)

Similarly, with respect to the *Covering* '*at Communion-time*'. The RUBRIC enjoins that the colour shall be *white*; RUBRIC and CANON both direct that the material shall be *linen*; and they also specify that it must be '*fair*.' But here we have an epithet

of doubtful import, and varied signification; consequently a door is open for the admission of every kind of ornament that shall not be contradictory to the prescribed colour, or fabric: the cloth therefore may be perfectly plain, or we sometimes see it ornamented with various Ecclesiastical emblems and devices: occasionally it will be bordered with texts of Scripture, and terminate with a fringe. In some Churches the Table is completely clothed with the white Linen Cloth, in others it will be covered only on the top, and ends; and, perhaps, partially, over the front. Still, whatever be its form, character, or dimensions, the injunction of the CANON imperatively requires, that it shall be a Covering '*as becometh that Table.*'

To be guided by the opinions of Ecclesiastical writers on this subject is impossible, the '*tot homines, tot sententiæ*', seem to prevail here, as in most other questions: that is to say, they are dependent upon the private taste and means of the Clergy; subject, however, to the interference of the Churchwardens.

A brief account of the ancient usage will perhaps explain the matter more satisfactorily

In the earliest ages of the Church, as BINGHAM informs us, '*Altars* were always covered with some decent *Cloth*, used for '*ornament, not for mystery.*' (*b. viii c. 6. §. 21.*). And we may gather from OPTATUS in his writings against the Donatists (*lib. vi. p. 95. 98.*), that the Tables then were usually covered with a '*Linen Cloth*' (*velamen, palla*). ISIDORE also mentions '*the Sindon*, (or '*fine linen*,) on which the body of Christ was consecrated' as a thing familiar in his day. (*ISID. Pelus. b. 1. Ep. 123.*). But as the Church advanced and prospered, and from the time of Constantine, '*Kings* became her nursing fathers, and *Queens* her nursing Mothers,' these '*Coverings*' gradually assumed a richer character; till they attained at last under the ceremonial of the Romish worship, a high degree of magnificence and splendour. To the *Altar-Cloths* of that age, which exhibited a pure *white* surface on the top and at the ends, were occasionally attached *Frontals* (*Antependia*) of the most gorgeous description, ornamented with the crucifix, the cross, and other sacred emblems; which were sometimes entirely fashioned of the precious metals; and not unfrequently set with jewels. From the ancient Inventories

of Ecclesiastical furniture, we find that many churches were possessed of several *Altar-Cloths* of different colours; these were intended for various occasions, and to be emblematical of certain of the Church festivals and seasons. Thus:—

*Green* or *Yellow* would be employed on ordinary Sundays, or other days.

*White* or *Blue*, on the Festivals of Confessors, Virgins, or Angels; and from the vigil of Christmas-day to the octaves of the Epiphany.

*Red* or *Purple*, on the solemnities of Apostles, Evangelists, and Martyrs; and from the vigil of Pentecost to Trinity Sunday.

*Violet*, on days of fasting and humiliation, and from Advent Sunday to the eve of the Nativity.

*Black*, and sometimes *Red*, on Good-Friday, and at Masses for the Dead.\*

These extravagancies, however, and the traditionary doctrines that originated and promoted them, were in this country completely swept away at the Reformation; nor has the Protestantism of the Church of England since suffered the symbolistic *Altar-Cloth*, and its superstitions, to be revived amongst us.

In 1550, when the *Altar* made way for the 'Communion-Table', the *Antependia* yielded to the simple Covering, subsequently described as a '*carpet of silk, or other decent stuff*'; the original design of which was merely to keep clean the 'fair white linen Cloth,' prescribed in the RUBRIC of the *Second Liturgy* of Edward VI. A. D. 1552. This we shall find confirmed by the authorities which follow.

In 1559. The *Injunctions* of Elizabeth required that the Communion-Table should be—'commonly covered, as *thercto belongeth*, 'and as shall be appointed by the Visitors.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 201, 202; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 84.).

In 1561. Among the '*Orders*' issued (as mentioned in page 543.) was one requiring, that the COMMUNION-TABLE should have 'thereon a fair *Linen Cloth*, with some covering of *silk, buckram*, 'or other such like, for the *clean keeping* of the said Cloth on the 'Communion-Board, at the cost of the Parish.'—(HEYLYN'S *Ref.* E. H. S. ii. 361.)

At this date also PARKHURST, *Bp. of Norwich*, issued certain *Injunctions*, in the 4th of which he directed—'that they neither

---

\* The Ecclesiastical *Vestments* worn by the Officiating Priests on the occasions referred to above, were of the same hue as the *Altar-Cloths*. *Blue* was supposed to be figurative of hope;—*Green*, of faith;—*Red*, of charity;—*Violet*, of mourning or penitential sorrow;—*White*, of purity;—*Yellow*, of wisdom. Further information on this subject may be gathered from the Catalogues given in *Neale* and *Le Keux's English Churches*, and from a communication of the *Rev. Richard Hart's* in the *Transactions* of the Norfolk and Norwich Archæological Society, Vol. 1.

'suffer the Lord's Table to be *hanged and decked* like an *Altar*.'—(quoted in GOODE'S *Cer. of Ch. of Eng.* p. 27.)

In 1564. The '*Book of Advertisements*' enjoined—'They shall decently cover with a *Carpet, Silk*, or other decent covering, and 'with a fair *Linnen Cloth* at the time of Ministration, the Communion-Table.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 292; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 125.)

In 1571. The *Canons* of that day merely required a '*clean Cloth*' to be placed on the Table.—'Curabunt mensam ex asseribus composite junctam...et mundum tapetem, qui illam contegat.'—(CARDWELL'S *Synod.* i. 123; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 235.)

About this period also, ABP. GRINDAL enjoined upon Archdeacons, that they take care,—'that no *Linen Cloths*, called '*Altar-Cloths*, and before used about Masses, be laid upon the COMMUNION-TABLE.'—(*Works*, p. 155.)

In 1603-4. the Code of CANONS, which are binding on the Clergy of the present day, directed 'the *Carpet of silk, or other decent stuff*,' and 'the fair *Linen Cloth*,' as shewn above. (p. 577.)

In 1637, the SCOTCH LITURGY appeared; a *Rubric* of which thus enjoins:—

'The holy TABLE having at the Communion-time a *carpet* and a fair white *Linen Cloth* upon it, with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall stand, &c.—(KEELING, p. 166.)

Here is a distinct order for the '*white Linen Cloth*' to be placed upon the carpet covering.

In 1638. BP. MONTAGUE inquires in his Visitation Articles—'Have you a covering or *carpet of silk, satten, damask*, or some more than ordinary stuff, to cover the Table with at all times, and a fair, clean, and fine *linen covering*, at the time of Administering the Sacrament?'—Camb. Ed. 1841. (quoted in *Hier. Angl.* p. 7.)

In 1641. Among the Charges brought by the Committee of the House of Lords against the Innovations of the Laudian Divines were these two—'(4) In making Canopies over the *Altar* so called, 'with traverses, and curtains on each side, and before it.' (5)... (6) 'In advancing crucifixes and images upon the parafront, or '*Altar-Cloth*, so called.'—(CARDWELL'S *Conf.* 272.)

In 1662. The last *Review* of the Liturgy was effected—the authorized Book of Common Prayer of the present day—herein, however, there is no reference to the *Altar-Cloth*, or any covering of 'the Communion-Table,' save the '*fair white Linen Cloth*' at Communion-time. (See above page 577.)

Such are the authoritative directions that have been issued since the Reformation with respect to this subject: and from the period of the Restoration to within the last few years, everything relating to it continued in a state of indifference, and



repose, but lately a spirit has been awakened for the study and restoration of Ecclesiastical architecture; and together with it a taste for Church decoration; as a part of which, the cross, the monogram, and other religious symbols have been in many instances introduced: sometimes with the full concurrence of the Congregation; sometimes undoubtedly in the face of disapproval and opposition. In the latter case, as has been already remarked, the question may be at once settled by the 82nd CANON, which refers the decision of such disputes to the authority of the Ordinary.

A few opinions may now prove serviceable.

NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712) says—‘That it was the practice of the primitive Church to have the *Altar* covered with a *clean Linen Cloth*, we may learn from several passages of OPTATUS (OPT. in *Don.* lib. VI.). . . . This was the ‘*Palla Altaris*,’ called so to distinguish it from the ‘*Corporis Palla*,’ or the Cloth thrown over the consecrated Bread. (GREG. *Sacr.* in Ord. *Diac.*). ST JEROM praises *Nepotianus* for keeping clean the *Linen* upon the *Altar*. (*Ep.* ad. *Nep.*). Indeed, in later times some superstition mixed itself with this matter. By the Roman Order the *Altar* was enjoined to be ‘uncovered during the latter part of the Passion Week, in remembrance of Our Saviour’s being stripped of his garment, and being forsaken of his Disciples. (AMAR. *Fort. Ecc. Off.* lib. v. DURAND. *Rat.* lib. I.) But this has been wisely laid aside by our Church, which has only ordered the decent *white covering* upon it during the time of celebration.’—*Com. Pr.* in loco.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742.) follows the opinion of NICHOLLS, remarking—‘The covering of the *Altar* with a *fair white Linen Cloth*, at the time of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, was a ‘primitive practice (OPT. *Milev.* VI. 113; HIERON. in *Ep.* ad *Nep.*) ‘enjoined at first, and retained ever since for its decency.’ . . . . (He then repeats the explanation given in the Sacramentary of Gregory, quotes the Rubric of the Scotch Liturgy, and the passage of the 82nd Canon enjoining ‘the carpet of silk or other decent stuff’, adding—) ‘which was originally designed for the clean keeping of the said (white linen) cloth (Order of *Eliz.* A. D. 1561; HEYLYN’s *Antid. Linc.* p. 45.), though the chief use of it now is ‘for ornament and decency.’ (p. 261.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of C. Pr.*

Among modern opinions we have the following.

REV. W. GOODE, after quoting the *Rubric* and the *Canon*, writes:—‘It will be observed here, that the Covering of the Table ‘in time of Divine Service, when the Communion is not about to be administered, is to be such as shall be “thought meet by the Ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it”; and ‘consequently it is entirely in the power of the Ordinary to prevent the use of any such tinsel trappings, and Popish “Altar-Cloths” ‘as have been of late introduced among us. The specific recognition by the CANON of the power of the Ordinary in this respect

'places this beyond doubt (p. 82.)...the grant of a discretionary power to the Ordinary to determine, in case of dispute, respecting the proper nature of the Covering. And I need hardly add, with respect to these Coverings for the Table, that *Images* upon the Cloth of the Communion-Table fall under the same prohibition that excludes them from the other parts of the Church.' (p. 83-4).—*Cer. of Ch. of England*.

REV. J. W. HEWETT says:—'The beauty of the *Altar*, whether wood or stone, need not be hidden by the '*decent carpet of stuff*' which the CANON prescribes, nor by the '*fair white Linen Cloth*' of the Rubric. The former should only lie upon the surface of the Table; the latter is to be a strip of the width of the Table, 'hanging over each end nearly to the ground.' (p. 11.)—*Arrangement of Par. Churches Considered*.

REV. J. JEBB remarks:—'The *Altar carpet* "of silk or other stuff," ought, according to the use of the Anglican Church, to cover the whole *Altar*, reaching to the ground; and to consist of silk or velvet, embroidered with some sacred device, (as the holy Name of Jesus.). It was anciently the custom, in Lent, to cover the *Altar*, and the *cushions* of the Stalls, &c. with stuff of a purple or grey colour, and black during Passion-Week, and times of mourning; a custom still retained in some places. In Lent, also, it may be remarked by the way, the Grammar Scholars of Canterbury used to attend Church in *violet gowns* (the ancient Ecclesiastical colour for mourning), and I believe *black Gowns* were worn either then, or in time of mourning, by the Choristers 'at York.' (p. 214.)...Referring to the injunction of the 82nd CANON, respecting the covering 'at other times,' the Author adds:—'It may be remarked, that while the *white Linen Cloth* is "to be "upon it," the *carpet* is to "cover it." Whence it may be inferred, that the *Linen Cloth* need only extend over the horizontal surface, while the ordinary Covering is to reach to the ground. And this is in accordance with the best precedents. There is no authority for the practice now frequently adopted, of leaving the stone or wooden front and side of the *Altar* exposed; nor are the precedents which may be urged from the practice of the unreformed Church (which, however, cannot outweigh the Canon) of great antiquity.' (p. 467.)—*Choral Service*.

REV. G. A. POOLE says:—'The ordinary furniture of the *Altar* consists of *three coverings*, two of the *Altar* itself, the one of *white Linen* with which it is covered during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and the other of *silk* (which, of course, includes *velvet*), or some other decent stuff, according to the wealth of the place. The *third covering* is the '*Napkin*,' with which the portions remaining after all have partaken of the Holy Communion are covered: all these admit no limits to their richness and appropriate decoration, but the circumstances of 'those by whom they are supplied.' (p. 106.)—*On Churches, their Structure, &c.*

REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, —commenting upon the rules that were imposed for the celebration of Divine Service during Prince Charles's residence at Madrid (1623), among which was this clause; 'That it (the room) be decently adorned Chapel-wise, with an *Altar, fonts, palls, linen coverings, demy carpets,*' &c.—says in a

note upon COLLIER's use of the word '*fonts*'—'perhaps we ought rather to read *fronts*. "Parafronts and suffronts" were among the articles of Altar furniture objected to as novelties of *Laud's* 'introducing.' (p. 21. n.)—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

DR. BURN quotes an ancient Constitution of APP. REYNOLDS, which directs—'The Archdeacons shall take care that the *Clothes* of the Altar be decent and in good order.' (*Lynd.* 52.). He likewise introduces the Statute, *Circumspectè Agatis*, (13 *Edw.* i. St. 4.), and the opinion of LORD COKE already transcribed (in p. 479.), which refers all matters concerning the Church being 'conveniently decked' to the spiritual Judge.—*Eccl. Law.* Phil. i. 367. e.

MR. A. W. PUGIN says:—'Before the 9th century, the primitive Altars were covered entirely with rich stuff or silk, embroidered with imagery, or even enriched with precious stones. Over this covering, a second of silk or linen was laid during the celebration of the sacred mysteries.'—*Gloss. of Eccl. Ornam. and Costume*, 26.

An Anonymous TRACT, entitled '*A Few Words to Churchwardens*,' remarks:—'The way of decking an Altar, though well meant, is often in bad taste.... In the Altar-Cloth also, and other hangings, none but appropriate emblems should be admitted. Above all things, I would shun such as are not of a religious cast, such as the rose, thistle, and shamrock. Nor would I put Angels, and Cherubs, in such places.' (p. 9.)... 'By all means let the outer coverings be taken away during the Week-Day Services, even though the Communion-Service be not used. There is no excuse for hiding the Altar in any and every way, as people do now.' (p. 10.)—Part II.

THE INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA, speaking of *Altar Coverings*, says:—'The right colour for the Festivals of Martyrs, and of course their octaves, is red: for all the highest Festivals, for S. Michael and All-Angels' Day, and for the Festivals of the Blessed Virgin, white, or gold: for Lent, Advent, Ember-Days, and Funerals, purple: and for ordinary occasions, green. In the examples given, the flowers are meant to be embroidered on canvass, cut out, and sewn on to the ground-work, which is to be silk, or velvet, or cloth, or brocade, of any allowable colour. The stalks, and the lighter parts, are worked immediately on the ground-work. The Frontal, and Super-frontal, are both fringed: the fringe ought to be of two or more colours, counter-charged. The 'Super-Altar' also has an embroidered Covering. The 'White Cloth' ought exactly to cover the top of the Altar, and to hang down over the two sides, not over the front. The frontal and sides may be attached to a brown-holland case, fitting exactly the top of the Altar, either by sewing, or by hooks and eyes. Over all lies the top covering of the Altar, its three sides hanging over the edge and forming the Super-frontal.' (reference is made for further explanation of the subject to '*The Ecclesiologist*,' New Series, Vol. i. p. 57.)—PLATE lxii. With regard to Diapers, in elucidating the examples given, it observes:—'The lines and patterns, in needlework, may be worked in yellow, on a ground of crimson, or of blue, or of green. Almost any colours are allowable.'—PLATE xxxvii.

From what has been now said it is evident that the *Altar-Cloth* at the present day is more for ornament and decency than absolute utility: and that it is to be provided by the Churchwardens, who are also to keep it in proper condition and repair. We may observe also that it is to be used at all seasons of Divine Worship; at Morning, and Evening Prayer, and at the Occasional Services. The economy of a prudent Churchwarden generally provides a loose *brown-holland cover* to be thrown over it at the conclusion of the Services; but for this to remain during the performance of any of the Church Offices has a very negligent and slovenly appearance.

Since the Incumbent has no legal nor prescriptive right to interfere with the Ornaments of the Church, except by reference to the Ordinary, he should proceed with discretion and caution in introducing any change in the *Coverings* of the Communion-Table. It rests with the Churchwardens to provide that the *Linen-Cloth* for 'Communion-time' be *fair* and *white*, as directed in the CANON. They must therefore take care that it is properly washed as occasion requires, otherwise the Officiating Minister may refuse to use it. This 'Linen Covering' is placed *over* the *Altar-Cloth*; and after being used it should be carefully folded up, and deposited with the proper Officer, who, strictly speaking, is the Minister's Churchwarden. It is not unfrequently the case, however, that the Churchwardens leave these arrangements entirely under the management of the Incumbent: sometimes, however, but improperly, they entrust them to the Clerk, or Sexton.

We must now direct attention to—

III. The NAPKIN.—The providing of the '*Fair Linen Cloth*,' formerly designated the '*Corporal*,' but now generally termed the *Napkin*, is imposed incidentally in the *second* RUBRIC following the distribution of the Elements, in these words:—

¶. 'When all have communicated, the Minister shall return 'to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same 'with a fair Linen Cloth.' (1662).—Present Book of Common Prayer.

This *Rubric* was introduced at the last *Review* of the Book of Common Prayer (1662); and appears to be derived from the *SCOTCH LITURGY* (1637), where we find this Cloth called also 'the *Corporall*.' It thus reads:—

'When all have communicated, he that celebrates shall go to 'the Lord's Table, and cover with a fair Linen Cloth 'or *Corporall*, that which remaineth' &c. (1637).—KEELING, 218.

The *RUBRIC*, and not the *CANON*, is our authority for the use of this Cloth, and the designation given it in the *Scotch Liturgy* is of no force at the present day.

The pattern and texture of the '*Napkin*' are generally in accordance with the 'white Linen Covering' of the Communion-Table, but its dimensions are arbitrary. With regard, however, to its being kept clean and in perfect repair, this duty will fall upon the Parishioners at large in the same manner as the 'white Linen Covering'; and with which it is usually deposited. There is no specific *RUBRIC*, or *CANON*, imposing this charge on the Churchwardens, still there is the general injunction embodied in the 85th *CANON*, requiring all the necessary Goods and Ornaments of the Church to be provided and maintained by the Churchwardens at the cost of the Parish. (see page 479.). The personal taste, and liberality of the Incumbent, may be exercised upon the ornamental character of the *Napkin*, as upon the other apparel of the Communion-Table, but it will be under similar restrictions. There are instances where the '*Napkin*' is dispensed with, a corner of the 'white Linen Covering' of the Communion-Table serving the purpose. The term *Napkin* is the ordinary appellation, derived from custom and not from Rubrical or Canonical law: the application of the term '*Corporal*' to the *Napkin* is scarcely defensible.

NICHOLLS observes:—‘This, by writers of the Latin Church, is called the ‘*Corporal*,’ because it was spread over the *Body* or ‘consecrated Bread. (*Alc. de Off. Div.*) It was likewise called ‘the *Palla* or ‘*Pall*.’ (*Radulph. Tungr. de Can. Obs.*). We find ‘the ‘*Corporal*’ to be in use in the time of *Isidore Pelusiota*, who flourished A. D. 440, who says, it was to represent the body of our ‘Saviour being wrapt in fine linen by Joseph of Arimathea. (*Isid. Pel. Ep.* 123.) . . . And *Victor Uticensis*, who lived 20 or 30 years ‘after him, mentions those as of common use in the Church, and ‘reports the horrid profanation of them by the heathen Vandals, ‘who, when they rifled the Churches, took these to make shirts ‘of. (*VICT. UTIC. de Persec. Vand.* l. i.). They were to be made ‘of *Linen* only, and not of silk, or cloth. The institution of them ‘is ascribed to *Eusebius*, Bp. of Rome, who lived about the year ‘300. (*Vid. GRATIAN de Con. Dist.* 2.)’—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco.

WHEATLY appears to follow NICHOLLS, for, after quoting the Rubric, he says—‘Which’ (the fair Linen Cloth) ‘by the ancient ‘writers and the *Scotch Liturgy*, in which this Rubric first appeared, ‘is called the ‘*Corporal*, from its being spread over the *Body* or ‘consecrated Bread, (*ALCUIN De Off. Div.*), and sometimes the ‘*Pall*’ (*Rad. TUNGR. de Can. obs.*), I suppose, for the same reason.’ (He then refers to its institution, and to the testimony of *Isidore Pelusiota*, in the words of NICHOLLS given above.)—*Rat. Ill. of Book of Com. Pr.* p. 302.

DR. HOOK thus explains the word ‘*Corporal*’—‘This is the ‘name given to the linen cloth which is spread over the body ‘(*Corpus*) or consecrated Bread, after the Communion. . . .’ (After quoting the concluding paragraph of WHEATLY’s, above given, and the *Rubric*, he then proceeds).—‘Our Reformers may have been ‘influenced in their retention of this decent ceremony after consecration, as a protest against the elevation of the “host” and “gazing” at the Sacrament.’—*Church Dict.* p. 201.

The REV. WM. PALMER writes:—‘In the Western Churches the ‘*Vessels* and *Linen Cloth* having been laid on the Table, and the ‘*oblations* of the people received. . . . the Priest selected from them ‘one or more Cakes or Loaves of Bread, which he placed on ‘the Table, and Wine, which he mingled with a small proportion ‘of water in the Cup. The Elements were then covered with a ‘*Veil*, or a portion of the *Linen Cloth*. (*MABILL. Lit. Gal.* p. 41; ‘*GAVANT. Thes. Merati.* \*i. 137, 139). In the Church of Constantinople ‘a different rite has long prevailed. There, after the Catechumens ‘have been dismissed, the Deacon and Priest convey in solemn ‘procession the Discus and Chalice, containing the Bread and ‘Wine, from the table of *Prothesis* to the Altar, (*ἡ μεγάλη εἰσοδος*. ‘*Vide GOAR. Rit. Græc.* p. 73. 131). According to the Roman ‘*Liturgy*, the Bread is placed on the *Linen Cloth*, without any ‘thing intervening.\* The custom of the Church of Constantinople,

---

\* MR. PALMER adds in a *Note*, that in GAVANTI’S *Thesaurus* ‘are various instances of Churches where the ‘*Linen Cloth*,’ or ‘*Corporale*, is still used to cover both the Table and the Cup.’ And when remarking upon the usage imposed in the *Roman Liturgy*, he has this Note—‘*Deponit hostiam circa medium*

'and the East, is to retain the Bread in the *Patena* or *Discus*, which is placed along with it on the Cloth. (GOAR, *ib.*)'—*Orig. Lit.* ii. 74.

[THE CORPORAS, CHALICE-VEIL, AND MANIPLE.]

In addition to the three Cloths or Coverings already considered, and which, as we have seen, are specifically enjoined in the RUBRICS, and the 82nd CANON, there may occasionally be found employed during the administration of the Lord's Supper in certain Churches of these days, three other Cloths, called (1) *The Corporas*, (2) *The Chalice-Veil*, and (3) *The Maniple*. We cannot but therefore refer to their origin and application, and see what authorities there are that may be supposed to sanction their introduction in modern times.

I. The '*Corporas*' is a fair white linen cloth placed on the '*Paten*,' and upon which is laid the Bread used at the Holy Communion. It is distinguished from the '*Corporal*' in the latter being required to be thrown over the Bread and Wine which remain after all have communicated. The use of the '*Corporas*' is warmly defended by many Clergymen of the present day: and their argument is built upon the fact of this Cloth being prescribed in the first LITURGY of *Edward VI* (A. D. 1549), and consequently is one of 'the Ornaments of the Church of England, as were (in use) by authority of Parliament in the 2nd year of the reign of King *Edward VI*,' ordered by the RUBRIC of our own Prayer Book.

The RUBRIC of the Liturgy of 1549 enjoining the use of the '*Corporas*' is the last of the four, which follow the Offertory Sentences in that Book; and thus reads:—

'Then shall the Minister take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion, laying the Bread upon the *Corporas*, or else in the *Paten*, or some other comely thing prepared for that purpose; and putting the Wine.' &c. (1549)—KEELING 185.

'anterioris partis *Corporalis* ante se, et *Patenam* ad manum dextram aliquantulum subtus *Corporale*.' (*Miss. Rom. Rit. celebr. Missam.* vii.)

The adoption, therefore, or rejection, of the '*Corporas*' depends upon the degree of authority attributed to the Rubric of the *First Liturgy*. If the Churchwardens refuse to supply the '*Corporas*,' the Minister cannot do so. Thence arises the question—not confined to this point alone, but extending to the Albe, the Cope, and other things of the like kind, viz:—has the Ordinary the power to compel the Churchwardens to supply every prescribed item which custom may have suffered to fall into disuse? Or, will the Court of Queen's Bench issue a *mandamus* to enforce these matters? We, on our own part, may inquire, whether the Ordinary would be willing to take such a step? Or, what Incumbent would be disposed to incur the risk of an expensive suit in the Courts of Westminster on a question of this nature? And further, if this should be done, would the end justify the means? It may be added in conclusion, that '*Corporas*' and '*Corporale*' are sometimes convertible terms. In HARTS' *Ecclesiastical Records*, we find upon the authority of GAVANTI'S *Thesaurus* (i. 317) that, the *Corporale* was that 'on which the hosts were laid 'at the time of their consecration, (and) was always of *fine linen*, 'though the exterior might be adorned with silk and gold. It was 'about 30 in. square, and was to be so folded that the borders might 'not appear.' (p. 233.)

3. The *Chalice-Veil* is not mentioned in any of the Rubrics of the Reformed Liturgies, nor in the CANONS: its design, however, is said to be to answer the purpose, of a lid or cover, to the Cup or Chalice. It is considered by some merely as a kind of second '*Corporate*,' or as the *Corporale* divided into two portions,—one to cover the Bread, the other the Cup or Chalice. The *Chalice-Veil* is derived from Romish use, and may be found described in GAVANTI'S *Thesaurus* (p. 320). HART defines it thus:—

'*Velum Calicis*, with which the Chalice was covered during 'a great part of the Mass, was of silk or of some other rich material, 'agreeing in colour with the Vestments worn by the Priest on that 'day. It was embroidered with gold, and had a cross worked 'upon it.' (p. 233)—*Eccles. Records*.

Although the introduction of such an appendage to the furniture of the Communion-Table may be defended on the plea of 'its usefulness in preventing the obtrusion of flies and other insects into the *Wine*,' yet it is not recognized by any authority of the Church of England, and might consequently be considered an unauthorized innovation, and subject to Episcopal prohibition. It is usually in the form of a *square cambric napkin*, ornamented with embroidery, and furnished with a lace border.



3. The *Maniple*, like the *Chalice-Veil*, finds no place in the RUBRICS or the CANONS of the Church of England; it is a superfluity derived from the Romish worship, where it is styled the *Mundatory*, or *Purificatorium*. This is a linnen cloth about 18 in. square, simply hemmed, and with a small cross of needlework in the centre. It was used to cleanse the Chalice after the ablutions, or *Post-Communion*. (GAVANTI *The*s. i. 319.)—HART'S *Ecc*l. *Records*. (p. 234.).

The form, however, assumed in these days, is that of the *Maniple*, or *Manup*le, of the Romish Ritual, symbolical of the office of the Sub-Deacon, and by him suspended from the left wrist. Those lately introduced into some few of our Protestant Churches are usually formed of a narrow strip of linen, about 4 ft. long, and from 6 in. to 9 in. wide, variously ornamented in diaper work, and terminating with a fringe. The uses to which they are applied are, 'to wipe the lips of the Chalice after partaking, to remove any accidental spilling of the Wine, and likewise to wipe the hand after Baptizing.' But their revival amongst us calls for a similar remark to that which was made respecting the introduction of the *Chalice-Veil*. (see *supra*.)\*

We will conclude our observations on this subject with one opinion.

DR. HOOK thus writes on this word—'*Maniple* or *Manup*le: originally a narrow strip of linen suspended from the left arm of the Priest, and used to wipe away the perspiration from the face: gradually it received embellishments, it was bordered by a fringe, and decorated with needle-work. It is not improbable that its use might be to clean the sacred vessels, as has been supposed by some, for in the 11th century it was given to the Sub-deacons as the insignia of their order. It is distinguished from the *Epigonaton* by being worn on the left side. The *Maniple* is not retained in the Ecclesiastical Vestments of the Church of England.'—*Church Dict*. p. 388.

The REV. R. HART thus describes this Ornament of Roman use:—'*The Maniple* (Sudarium) was an oblong piece of embroidered silk or velvet, like a miniature Stole. It was folded double, passed over the left wrist, and hung down.'—*Norfolk Archæolog. Soc. Trans*. Vol. I.

---

\* There appears however to be a somewhat extensive demand both for the *Maniple*, and the *Chalice-Veil*, otherwise we should hardly see them so repeatedly advertized as they are, nor find such elaborate designs displayed in their manufacture, as a visit to Mr. Gilbert French's at Bolton, or to Messrs. Cox and Son in London, will confirm.

## [COVERINGS OF THE FLOOR, &amp;c.]

The *Carpets*, *Pede-Cloths*, and coverings of the like kind over the floor of the Chancel, and round the Communion-Table, are comparatively of modern date, and as they are devoid of Canonical and Rubrical authority, and owe their existence to the mere luxury and refinements of the age, and the will and fancy of the Incumbent, they cannot come under our notice as necessary or customary portions of Ecclesiastical or Church Furniture. Where there is any *tesselated pavement* of ancient date, or flooring of the *Encaustic* and decorated *tiles* of the Medieval period, a simple *mat* on which the Officiating Minister may stand will answer the purposes of health and comfort, rather than this ornamental work should be concealed from view: the same may be said where '*Brasses*' are to be met with. Coverings of this kind are desirable only in the case, which certainly ought not to exist, of a dilapidated pavement. Fabrics of various qualities and patterns are manufactured expressly for such purposes: and when these may be too expensive, *Cocoa-nut*, or *Indian matting*, particularly the former, will furnish a useful and durable substitute. It is very desirable that the *aisles* and *passages* of the Church be covered, in order to prevent the noise of the scuffling and traffic of the feet: besides which, these coverings add much to the warmth of the Church in the winter season by preventing the cold evaporations from the stone flooring. The cost of these mattings fall upon the Churchwardens. It need scarcely be added, that in these cases, as in others previously referred to, care should be taken that whatever is introduced should not obtrude any peculiar doctrinal characteristics, nor be symbolic of party views, so as to create objections, and probably call for the interference of the Ordinary.

## [COMMUNION-CUSHIONS, AND DESKS.]

It is a very common practice to have two *Cushions* placed on the Communion-Table, on which to lay the '*SERVICE BOOK*.' They are not enjoined by any authority, nor are they indispensably necessary. Many Clergymen, indeed, object to them. If *Cushions* are desired, they cannot be demanded from the Churchwardens, but must be procured at the expence of the Incumbent. These *Cushions*, according to the authorities quoted below, should be small and flat, and

stuffed with *wool* or *horse-hair*, not with feathers: they are generally covered with the same material as the Altar-Cloth, and may be ornamented with fringes, &c.

In some Churches an elevated *Desk* is preferred, which may be made of ornamental *iron-work* of gothic design, or of *oak* carved after some Ecclesiastical pattern. Those of *iron* stand the firmest: the dimensions of the ground-plan outline, that we have met with, appear to be about 14 *in.* by 8 *in.*; the perpendicular elevation of the back 15 *in.*; the perpendicular elevation of the front 3 *in.* whence projects a *ledge* to support the Book, and from which rises a retiring slope, at an incline of about 45 degrees, against which the Book reposes. The front 3 *in.* elevation is continued round the *Desk*, so as to form a kind of ornamental base.

The REV. R. HART describes the ante-Reformation *Cushions* thus:—The *Pulvinar*, or *Cussinus*, was the *Cushion* stuffed with 'wool or horse-hair (not with feathers), on which the Missal was laid, (*Gavant*. i. 319), and was usually of velvet richly embroidered.' (p. 234.)—*Ecel. Records*.

The REV. W. HEWETT says:—'A small *Kneeling-Desk* should be provided on the north side of the Altar, so that the Officiating Priest may not place his Book, nor lean, upon the Holy Table; another is to be placed in front of the Sedilia; and a third in front of the Altar, whenever, that is, the "Confession" is said there, as it is to this day in Exeter Cathedral.' (p. 11.)—*Arrangement of Par. Churches*.

The HIERURGIA ANGLICANA enumerates the *Cushion* among the Furniture of Bp. Andrewes's Chapel, as well as among the inventories of the ornaments of other Chapels. (p. 8—33.).

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA states:—'Nor again is there authority for placing *finely-bound Books* upright on the Altar. There ought to be during the Liturgy, one "*Cushion*," small and flat,—or else a low *Desk*,—and upon it one Book of the *Communion-Office*.' (PLATE 58.)... 'The "*Altar-Desk*"—in the present design of metal, although other materials are allowable, and a '*Cushion*' is sufficient—is recommended for supporting the Service-Book in a convenient position for the Reader, during the celebration of Holy Communion. Only one Book is required on the Altar, which may be taken in turn as required by the Assistant Clergy. The idea of this '*Desk*' is borrowed from illuminations.'—(PLATE 72).

In the Tract, 'A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS,' the author writes:—'I do not like to see '*Cushions*' on the Table, as if

‘it were a mere place to lean upon.’ Again, modern Altar-Tables are ‘almost always too low: they ought to be so high, that the ‘Clergyman may kneel at them, and not loll upon them.’—*Part II. p. 9.*

### *Communion-Plate.*

#### CHALICE or CUP. FLAGON. PATEN.

The *Vessels* necessary for the administration of the Lord’s Supper are (1) the *Cup* or *Chalice* for the WINE, called in the CANON a *Pot* or *Stoop* (Stoup); and (2) the *Paten* for the BREAD. In some instances (3) a *Flagon* is employed; either for holding the Wine before consecration: or, as in large Churches where the Communicants are numerous, in order that a sufficient quantity of Wine may be consecrated at one time; and out of which it is poured into the *Cup* for distribution.

The CANON only enjoins the *Pot* or *Stoop* (Stoup), and that it shall be of metal: thus—

‘The Churchwardens of every Parish, against the time of every Communion, shall at the Charge of the Parish, with the advice and direction of the Minister, provide a sufficient quantity of fine white BREAD, and of good and wholesome WINE, for the number of Communicants that shall from time to time receive there: *which Wine we require to be brought to the Communion-Table in a clean and sweet standing POT or STOUP of pewter, if not of purer metal.*—CANON 20.

The RUBRICS of the Liturgy give no distinct direction with respect to supplying these *Vessels*, yet they assume that they are provided. The *Cup* is specifically mentioned in the RUBRIC before the ‘Prayer of Consecration,’ also at the delivery of the Wine, and where the Officiating Minister is instructed how to proceed to a *second* Consecration. In the *marginal* RUBRICS also of this ‘Prayer,’ the Priest is ordered ‘to take the PATEN,’ and ‘the CUP into his hand;’ and ‘to lay his hand upon every Vessel (be it ‘CHALICE or FLAGON) in which there is any Wine ‘to be consecrated.’

Here *three* Vessels are distinctly spoken of;

- (1) the *Cup* or *Chalice*,
- (2) the *Flagon*,
- (3) the *Paten* :

yet the *Flagon* is not mentioned elsewhere, either in CANON, or RUBRIC, and cannot therefore be considered as an indispensable requisite: indeed the *Cup* or *Chalice* is the only Vessel that is absolutely ordered, and its material prescribed, which, according to the CANON, must be of '*pewter*, or *purer metal*.' The character of the *Paten* is nowhere defined, so that in small country Parishes, too poor to furnish a more costly vessel, a common *earthenware plate* frequently serves the purpose.

Writers on *Ecclesiastical Law* seem generally to confine themselves to the requirements of the *Canon* with respect to the Sacramental Vessels.

DR. BURN, after quoting CANON 20, adds:—'The Parishioners 'shall find at their own charge the CHALICE or CUP for the Wine '(WINCHELSEA, *Lyndw. Prov. Const.* Aug. 252.); which, says 'LYNDWOOD, although expressed in the singular number, yet is 'not intended to exclude *more than one*, where more are necessary. '(ib).—*Ecol. L. Phil.* i. 370.—This opinion is followed by CRIPPS in *L. of Ch. & Cl.* p. 418; by SPELLEN in *Vestry-Clerk & Par. Law*, p. 18; by STEER in *Par. Law*, ed. Clive, p. 35; by STEPHENS in *L. Rel. to Cl.* p. 289. But ROGERS in his *Ecol. L.* (p. 155.) merely quotes the CANON.

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*), after quoting the CANON, says that the Churchwardens—'Are to take care that the 'Church be in like manner provided with a fair *Chalice*, or 'Communion *Cup with a Cover*, and one or more *Flagons*. '(AYLIFFE'S *Par.* 304; LYNDW. 252).—*Churchwd. Guide.* p. 43.

The usual practice has been for the Churchwardens to provide a *plated Cup with cover*, and a *Paten*, and in large Parishes a *Flagon* also. But in some instances a wealthy congregation, or the munificence of an Incumbent, or of some Parishioner, may present a service of Communion-Plate, made of the more precious metals.

As these Vessels belong to the Parish, they are generally under the custody of the Churchwardens; who secure them in a strong chest, deposited either in

the Vestry-Room, or in the residence of the Minister, or of one of themselves. Sometimes there is a *Cup-board* (*Aumbry, Ambry, Almery,*) in the Vestry-Room made especially safe for this purpose. In the generality of instances, however, the keeping of the *Communion-Plate* is entrusted to the Incumbent: for, in administering the Holy Sacrament to the Sick, Clergymen who are not provided with a '*Pocket Service*' of these Vessels, and others who object to the use of '*toy Services*' (as they designate these diminutive specimens), frequently employ the Church Plate for such occasions. To convey the *Cup* and *Paten*, and the '*Elements*', to the house of a sick parishioner a light portable *Box*, lined with baize, and provided with proper compartments, is extremely useful, and far preferable to a *Bag*, or *Basket*. At every '*administration*' the *Officiating Minister* should take care to see that the Sacred Vessels are clean, and in proper condition.

We may add a few historical remarks, and Ecclesiastical opinions on the usage of these Vessels.

I. The *Chalice* or *Cup*.—In the *first* Liturgy of *Edward VI.* (1549), one of the *marginal Rubrics* at the '*Prayer of Consecration*' directed the Priest when to '*take the Cuppe into his hands:*' but these Rubrics were omitted in the Review of 1552, and were not restored till the last Revision in 1662. (CLAY'S *B. of C. Pr. Ill.* p. 118.)

In the survey of the Church goods of the county of Northampton, ordered by EDWARD VI. in 1552, the Commissioners were required—'to leave in every Parish Church or Chapel of '*common resort, one, two, or more CHALICES or CUPS, according to the multitude of the people in every such Church or Chapel.*'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 101.

In 1553, and 1554. BONNER, *Bp. of London*, issued a monition that a *Chalice* (Calicem) among other things should be provided in each Parish of his Diocese. (*ib.* 115, 143).

In 1569. ABP. PARKER inquires—'Whether they do minister in '*any prophane cuppes, bowles, dishes, or Chalices heretofore used at Masse, or else in a decent Communion-Cuppe provided and kept for the same purpose only.*'—(*ib.* 321.). So likewise enjoined ABP. GRINDAL (Art. 7.), according to BP. COSINS (in NICHOLLS' *Add. Notes* p. 40.)

BP. ANDREWES, (1643), at the conclusion of the 'Offertory Sentences,' says:—'Into his hands the Priest from a by-standing Table on the south side, reaches first the WAFER-BREAD, in a *Canister* close covered and lined with *Linnen*. 2ndly. The WINE in a *barrel* or a *cradle* with four feet.'—(Add. Notes to NICHOLLS' *Com. Pr.* p. 40.). In the description of the furniture of BP. ANDREWES' Chapel, given in the *HIERURGIA ANGLICANA*, mention is made of—'The silver and gilt *canister* for the WAFERS, like a wicker basket, and lined with cambric laced. The *Tonne* (dagon) upon a cradle. The *Chalice*, having on the outside of the bow, Christ with the lost sheep on His shoulders; on the top of the cover the Wise Men's star, both engraven; it is covered with a *linen napkin* (called the *aire*) embroidered with coloured silks. Two *Patens*. The *Tricennale*, being a round ball with a screw cover whereout issue three pipes, and is for the Water of mixture.' (p. 8.).

DR. NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712) gives an historical account of these Vessels; thus—'The CUP, which the consecrated Wine is delivered in, is called by this name (*Chalice*). That in the earlier times of Christianity the CHALICES were made of wood is evident from that remarkable passage in the council of *Tribur*, (A. D. 811.) as 'tis mentioned in GRATIAN (*Decr. de Consecr. Dist. i. c. 44. Vasa &c.*). "The vessels in which the holy mysteries are performed are *Chalices* and *Patens*, of which BONIFACE, Martyr and Bishop, being once asked if it were lawful to consecrate in wooden *Chalices*, he made this answer:—Formerly golden Priests made use of wooden *Chalices*, but now wooden Priests do consecrate in gold." About the 2nd century they began to leave off the wooden *Chalices*, unless in very poor Churches, and to use glass ones, or some finely cut out of marble; this use is said to be brought in by ZEPHIRINUS bp. of Rome, after the year 200. Of these glass *Chalices*, TERTULLIAN (*de Pudic.*) takes notice. And of this sort must that *Chalice* be, which ATHANASIUS was accused to have broken in his passion. (ATH. *Apol.* 2.). Upon these glass *Chalices* in Tertullian's time, which was the beginning of the 3rd century, there seems to have been engraved or painted, the picture of our Saviour, or the good Shepherd carrying his lamb upon his shoulders, as PAMELIUS interprets the place. . . . When the government became Christian, golden and silver *Chalices* came in use. ANASTASIUS (*Life of Silvester*) says, that to the Church which Constantine built at Rome, he gave a silver *Paten* weighing 20 lbs., and twenty ministerial *Chalices* to deliver the Wine in, weighing 3 lbs. a piece. And the same writer (in *Life of Adrian*) says, that he gave a *Paten* and a *Chalice* to St Peter's of Rome, made of pure gold, weighing together 24lbs. And indeed the Furniture of the Altars in those times was so pompous, that it drew the envy of the heathen upon the Christians, and occasioned that remark of the Questor FELIX (recorded in THEOD. *Ecc. Hist.* III. c. 12.), who seeing so many costly vessels of silver and gold in the temple of Antioch, cried out, "With what sumptuous Vessels do they minister to the Son of Mary!" By a Canon of the Council of Rhemes, in CHARLES the Great's time, all Churches were obliged to have *Chalices* of some purer metal. Wooden Cups are forbid because of their porosity, glass ones because they are so liable to be broken, brazen ones because of their ill smell; therefore this

'Council enjoins, "That every PATEN and CHALICE, if it be not of gold, must be at least of *silver* or *tin*." (Conc. Rhem. *Can.* 6.). The ancient *Chalices* were of two kinds; the *greater*, which were in the nature of our *Flagons*, containing a large quantity of Wine, which was all consecrated in them together; and the *lesser*, which were otherwise called *Ministeriales*, because the Priest delivered the WINE to be drank out of them: for Communion in one kind was not then invented by the Romish Church; for these 20 *ministerial Chalices*, which Constantine gave to the Church that he built at Rome, were something too many for the Priests, who officiated in that Church to drink out of; but were few enough for so vast a Communion as there must be in that populous city.—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco. (SHEPHERD in his *Elucid. of B. of Com. Pr.* vol. II. p. 219; gives the substance of the above. MR. STEPHENS, in his *Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 1205, quotes this passage in full.).

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723), speaking of the Sacramental Vessels, states that—"The materials were sometimes no better than plain *glass* or *wood*: and after referring to the authority of Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others, he mentions Jerom, who 'speaking of Exuperius, bp of Tholouse, and commending his frugality, tells us that he ministered the body of Christ in a *basket of osiers*, and the blood in a *glass cup*. . . I shall only add, that in one of our own Synods here in England, the Synod of Calcutb, anno 787, there is a Canon which forbids the use of *horn cups* in the celebration of the Eucharist, which seems to imply that they were in use before.' . . The author then mentions 'that the wealthier Churches had their Sacred Vessels of Silver and Gold.'—*Antiq. of Chr. Ch.* VIII. c. 6. §. 20.

The REV. W. GOODE writes:—"Besides the Vessels immediately required for the ministration of the Holy Communion, namely, the "*Paten*," "*Cup*" and "*Chalice* or *flagon*" containing the WINE to be consecrated,' (mentioned in the *marginal Rubric* of the Prayer of Consecration,) the only ornament' &c. (p. 82).—*Cer. of Ch. of England*.

The REV. R. HART, describing the Altar-Plate of the Romish Church, says;—"The *Chalice*, (was that) in which the Wine and Water were placed in order to their consecration, having a *node* or *pomum* in the centre of its stem, and generally a *cover*. . . '*Pugillares*,' or '*Canaliculi*, were pipes or tubes of gold or silver, through which the Laity received the Wine out of the *Chalice* before the use of that Element was denied them altogether. (*Staveley* p. 190).—*Ecel. Record.* p. 235.

DR. HOOK, explaining the word '*CHALICE*', says:—"The *Cup* in which the consecrated Wine for the Eucharist is administered. The primitive Christians, desirous of honouring the holy purpose for which it was used, had it made of the most costly substances their circumstances would allow—of glass, crystal, onyx, sardonyx, and gold.' (He then quotes the *Canon* of the Council of Rheims from *Nicholls*, as given above). . . . Under the Word "*CUP*", the same author writes:—"The sacred Vessel in which the consecrated Wine in the Lord's Supper is conveyed to the Communicant, distinguished from the *Flagon*, in which the



'WINE is brought to the Altar, and in which, if more than the Cup will conveniently hold is required, it is consecrated. The RUBRIC directs that it shall be *delivered* to each Communicant.'—*Church Dict.*

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA furnishes what it considers the most correct designs for the *Vessels* of the Communion-Table, and which, it adds, cannot be executed by the ordinary silversmiths. With respect to the 'CHALICE,' we read:—'Every part is wrought, casting not being allowable. The *Knop* is generally pierced. This, and every other part, may be, and have been, elaborately jewelled, and decorated with enamels. The *bowl* is circular: yet a CHALICE with a hexagonal bowl is preserved in Mainz Cathedral. The *foot* is nearly always hexagonal: though round and octagonal feet have been known. The general type being preserved, an infinite number of patterns of ornament may be employed. One CHALICE, given in the Plate, shows the legend ("Calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen DOMINI invocabo.") engraved on the ancient example preserved at Trinity College, Oxford. Of course the inscriptions may vary. CHALICES are made also of several sizes.\*—PLATE 55.

II. The *Flagon*,—The use of the *Flagon* is either to hold a sufficient quantity of Wine where the number of the Communicants is large, so that it may all receive consecration at one time; or to dispense with the appearance on the Communion-Table of the common *black wine-bottle*. (See DR. NICHOLLS' account of the *Chalice*, *supra* page 597).

BP. WREN in 1636, among other directions issued throughout the Diocese of Norwich, orders:—'That no *wicker bottles* or *tavern pots* be brought unto the Communion-Table, and that the BREAD be brought in a clean *cloth* or *naphin*.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* II. 205.

The REV. R. HART describes several Vessels used in the Church before the Reformation, answering to our *Flagon*, thus:—'The "*Bureta*," or "*Burette*," a pitcher, usually of gold or silver, containing the Wine which was to be consecrated during the Mass. (*Du Cange* in voce). The "*Anax*" was a larger *Flagon*, applicable to the same purpose, but belonging to more primitive times. (*Mabillon de Lit. Gal.* 63.). "*Ampullæ vitreæ vini et aquæ*," were Cruets of glass or crystal upon a stand of metal (which was

---

\* Mr. KEITH, 59, *Britannia Terrace, London*, who professes to have worked for the "Ecclesiological Society" for 10 years, advertizes a 'Service' of Church Plate of silver at the following prices. CHALICE £9. (gilt £11.); PATEN £3. 10s. (gilt £4. 10s.); FLAGON £13. (gilt £16.). OFFERTORY BASINS in *metal-gilt*, from £3. 10s. to £10.; in *silver*, from £7. to £40.; in *silver-gilt*, from £9. to £50. Metal COLLECTING-PLATES, 15s. each. Services for the 'Communion of the Sick,' from £5. 10s. to £10.

'termed, '*pelvicula hamularum*.'—Gavant. i. 318.). In these two 'Cruets the Wine and Water were presented at the Altar before 'consecration. Each had a *Cover*.'—*Eccl. Records*. p. 235.

DR. HOOK defines the 'FLAGON' as—'A Vessel used to contain 'the Wine, before and at the consecration in the holy Eucharist. 'In the *marginal Rubric* in the 'Prayer of Consecration,' the 'Priest is ordered 'to lay his hand upon every Vessel (be it CHALICE 'or FLAGON) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated ;' but in the 'same Prayer he is told to take the *Cup* only in his hand; and the 'Rubric before the Form of administering the *Cup* stands thus, "'the Minister that delivereth the Cup." The distinction then 'between the *Flagon*, and the *Cup* or *Chalice*, will be, that the 'latter is the Vessel in which the consecrated WINE is adminis- 'tered; the *Flagon* that in which some of the WINE is placed for 'consecration, if there be more than one Vessel used.'—*Church Dict.*

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA describes these Vessels under the terms *Cruets* or *Flagons*: and gives examples of some with handles and spouts, and others without. It then adds:—' *Cruets* 'must be entirely of hammered metal, and are of difficult execution. 'Two very appropriate legends are given in the plate: "*Gloria 'in excelsis Deo. Alleluia*:" And "*Te laudamus, Tibi bene- 'dicimus*." Where there are many Communicants, our Rubrics 'permit the WINE to be consecrated in the *Flagon*. Should this 'not be necessary, the *Cruet* will of course remain on the 'Side- 'Table.' In any case the *Flagon* will stand on the 'Side-Table' 'until the oblation. It is suggested that a pair of *Flagons* of 'moderate size are more convenient and more beautiful than one 'large one.'—*Plate 56*.

III. The *Paten*.—This Vessel, as before observed, is usually of *plated* metal, or of *silver*. Sometimes in poor village Churches it is the common earthenware plate of domestic use; and, occasionally, the *cover* of the Chalice, where such exists, answers the purpose of the *Paten*.

DR. NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712.) says:—'The *Paten* is the plate in 'which the sacred BREAD is laid.' The original word, which is '*Patena*,' signifies a wide open Dish. Thus COLUMELLA speaks 'of "*lata vasa in modum patenarum*." (l. i.) And its diminutive '*Patella*' is of more common use. In the more primitive times, 'when the Christians were but of mean condition, and their state 'of persecution would not allow them to pretend to anything that 'was magnificent, the Sacramental Bread was laid only upon a '*Plate* made of *osiers* or *wood*. Thus S. JEROM speaks of *Rusticus*, 'a pious but parsimonious Bishop.... "No one richer than he; and 'yet he carries the Lord's Body on a *wickow plate*, and His Blood 'in a *glass Cup*." (Ep. IV. *ad Rust.*). After this (as WALAFRIDUS

---

\* '*Patena*, seu *Patina*, est vasis genus a patendo dictum.'  
—*Isidore*.

'STRABO writes, and the Council of *Tribur* witnesses) Pope ZEPHYRINUS, about the year 230, brought in the use of *glass Patens*, (*De Reb. Eccl.* c. 14.). But in the Council of *Rhemes*, which was held in the year 813, as 'tis quoted by *Gratian* (Can. *ut Calix de Consecr.* Dist. 1.), 'tis ordered, that *Patens*, and *Chalices*, should be made either of *gold* or *silver*. But this was the custom before in the Churches of wealthy cities. (Vid. CHRYS. *Hom.* 16; *ad Eph.* 16.; *ad Pop. Ant.*; S. AUG. *Con.* 2. in *Ps.* 113.).—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco. (SHEPHERD in his *Eluc. of B. of Com. Pr.* vol. II. p. 218, gives the substance of this passage.).

COLLIS writes:—'The Priest is to take the *Paten* into his left hand, and then break the BREAD there: and then only lay his hand upon the BREAD, in any other *Paten*. The same he is to do by the *Cup*, holding it in his left hand, and not setting it down till the end of the Prayer.' (p. 94.)—*On the Rubric*.

The Rev. R. HART, speaks of the '*Paten*' before the period of the Reformation as—'A Plate usually of silver, on which the 'host' to be consecrated at that Mass is presented by the Deacon to the celebrant. It was to be concave, and the rim thin enough to be of use in collecting the sacred particles. (*Merati*, p. 101.). The 'Cover' of the *Chalice* was however often used as a substitute for a '*Paten*.'—*Eccl. Records*, p. 235.

DR. HOOK, in explanation of '*Paten*,' merely adopts the first two lines of NICHOLLS' comment, quoted above.

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA says:—'*Patens* must present no great inequality on their upper surfaces; which accordingly can admit only engraving and enamelling for ornament.... A *Paten* is made to fit the top of the bowl of its '*Chalice*;' whence it has been sometimes called a '*Cover*.' Legends and jewellery are admissible on the outer rim. The hexagonal form prevails also in the ornamenting of the *Paten*. If the whole upper surface cannot be gilt, it is usual to gild the middle, as also the inner part of the bowl of the *Chalice*.'\*—*Plate 55*.

\* With respect to the *Offertory Basin*, we omitted to state that the INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA observes:—'These are made of Pewter, or of latten, or of precious metal. The selection of Legend and subject ought to have reference to the purposes of the *Alms-Basin*. The offering of the "Wise Men" from *Beato Angelico* ... was successfully hammered in silver on a larger scale for the Lord Bishop of Fredericton. It is not necessary that the Basin should be very large, since it occupies, when laid on the Altar, a great deal of space. The proper place for the *Alms-dish* is not on the Altar until the Alms are offered in it, but on the 'Credence.' It is to be regretted that the Chapels Royal, for example, have encouraged the bad practice of placing *Offertory-Basins* and *Salvers* on the Altar for the sake of display.'—*Plate 58*.

## [ Communion—Rails.]

Separating the Communion-Table by *Rails* is not enjoined in any CANON, LAW, or RUBRIC of the Church, possessing authority at the present day. It has, however, been the custom from the time of ABP. LAUD, or rather from the period of the *Restoration*, almost universally, to enclose the Communion-Table with *Rails*, in order to prevent it from being profaned and desecrated. An injunction to this end was first issued by LAUD in 1633 (see *page 544 supra*), but it did not generally take effect, says CARDWELL, till 1636; and then not without the greatest opposition. (*Doc. Ann.* II. 187. n.).

BP. WREN in 1636, in his directions to the Clergy of the Diocese of Norwich, required—‘That the *Rail* be made before it (the ‘*Communion-Table*’) according to the Archbishop’s late injunctions, reaching cross from the north wall to the south wall, near ‘one yard in height, so thick with pillars, that dogs may not get ‘in.’—(*ib.* 202.).

In 1640. the *Convocation* through the influence of LAUD passed a set of CANONS, in the 7th of which it was ordered, that the Communion-Table should be separated by ‘*Rails*.’ The binding authority of these CANONS upon the Clergy of modern times has been already discussed at large and disavowed in *page 294*; to which the Reader is referred for fuller information in respect of their legal force. As regards, however, the particular subject under our consideration, the *Canon* thus enjoins:—

‘And because experience hath shewed us, how irreverent the ‘behaviour of many people is in many places, some leaning, others ‘casting their hats, and some sitting upon, some standing, and ‘others sitting under the ‘*Communion-Table*’ in time of Divine ‘Service: for the avoiding of these, and the like abuses, it is ‘thought meet and convenient by this present Synod, that the ‘said ‘*Communion-Table*’ in all Chancels or Chappels be decently ‘severed with *Rails*, to preserve them from such or worse profanations.’—(See *supra* p. 295. n; and p. 544; and SPARROW’S *Coll.* 361.).

These ‘*Rails*’ ought properly to extend completely across the Chancel; yet they need not of necessity be fixtures. In some Churches, indeed, they are removed when there is no administration of the Holy Communion; or they are so contrived as to fold back against the north and south walls, or to fall into the

floor. They are rendered almost indispensable from the assistance they afford to the aged and infirm in kneeling, and rising up. The repair of the *Communion-Rails* devolves upon the Churchwardens, and of course at the charge of the Parish. (See the case of *Newson v. Baldry*. p. 487. *supra*).

DR. HOOK, in his explanation of these *Rails*, says:—‘*Altar-Rails* as such, and as distinguished from the Chancel Screen, were not known before the Reformation. We probably owe them to ABP. LAUD, who, when the Chancel and Altar-Screen had been broken down, and a Table set up in the Nave by Ultra-Protestants, in the Church, ordered an Altar-Table to be placed in the Chancel, and protected from rude approach by *Rails*. As the use of *Altar-Rails* arose out of, and visibly signified respect for, the great mysteries celebrated at the Altar, they were, of course, a mark for the hostility of the Puritans, and accordingly, in the journal of William Dowsing, Parliamentary Visitor of Churches in the great Rebellion, we find that they were every where destroyed. They have generally, however, been restored; and there are now few Churches in England, where they are not found.’—*Church Dict.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, referring to the CANON of 1640. directing *Rails* to be set up, states:—‘The Commons soon after ordered that the Tables should be removed into the body of the Church, and that the *Rails* should be taken away.’ He adds in a note—(‘Sept. 8th, 1641. (*Nelson*. ii. 482.). The order was published without the concurrence of the other House’)... ‘From what we have seen, it may be concluded,’ (among other things)... ‘that whereas some of our “Ecclesiologists,” who in general make much of Laud’s authority, are earnest for the abolition of *Rails*, the introduction of this protection was one of his chief measures for the ordering of Churches.’ In a Note is added—(‘*Altar-Rails* are sanctioned by the Roman Church, as well as the *Rails* or Screens which separate the Chancel from the Nave.’) (p. 160—162.).—*How Shall We Conform to the Lit.*

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA, describing its illustration, says:—‘The *Kneeling-Rail* is of iron, and will stand firmly by its own weight. The ornamental scroll-work may be omitted if found too expensive. Fixed *Altar-Rails* are not to be recommended: and the present *Rail* is proposed for occasional use, when required at Communion by infirm or aged persons. It will then be placed in the middle before the Altar. It may also be used at the West end of the Church for the ‘Churching of Women.’—*Plate 72.*

## [The Credence-Table.]

This ancient appendage to the Altar is not recognized by any RUBRIC or CANON of the Church of England now in force; nor is it sanctioned by general custom, or by the popular voice; but as the *Credence-Table* is occasionally to be met with, and we profess to give information on all subjects connected with the order and discipline of our Church, it demands from us some notice of its use and origin, and a few remarks as to its admissibility into the Churches of the present day. In discussing these points, it will perhaps prove more satisfactory if we employ other words than our own, and proceed at once to cite the historical evidences we possess, and such modern authorities as have expressed themselves upon the subject. We will merely premise that the '*Credence*,' or '*Credence-Table*,' is a *Side-Table* or *Shelf* near the Communion-Table, upon which the Elements are placed ready for the Officiating Minister to transfer to the Communion-Table at the conclusion of the Offertory, as directed by the RUBRIC.

In 1641. in the Proceedings of the Committee of the House of Lords touching the innovations of the Laudian divines, it was charged against them—'Having a *Credentia*, or '*Side-Table*,' besides the *Lord's Table*, for divers uses in the Lord's Supper.'—CARDWELL's *Conf.* p. 273.

BR. SPARROW (*ob.* 1685.) leads us to infer that the '*Credence-Table*' was in use in his day; he says:—'Then' (after the Nicene Creed) 'the Ministers and devout people, reverently beholding the holy signs, not yet consecrated, but blessed and offered up to God on a *by-standing Table*, called '*The Table of Proposition*' (*πράπεζα προθεσεως*), praise' &c. (p. 161.)—*Rationale*.

DR. NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712.) writes:—'In the Greek Church there is a double Offertory, the first is when the *Δώρα* or Elements are solemnly presented, or offered at a *Side-Table* near the Altar, which they call the *Πρόθεσις*, and then this Prayer is said: "*O God* &c." (*Chrys. Lit.*) And so the Elements lay, till the first part of the Communion-Service was said, and at which the Catechumens were allowed to be present; but after they were gone, then came on the '*Απόθεσις*, or removing them from the '*Side-Table* to the Altar.... Since the Rubric has not authorized the setting up a *Side-Table*, the Priest must be content either himself to go into the *Vestry* to fetch the Elements, or he must

'receive them at the hands of his Deacon or Clerk, and then place them upon the Table; for place them there *he* must, and *no one* else, tho' it be not said *where they are to be set*, before they are so placed.'—*Book of Com. Pr.* in loco.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723.) writes:—'In many Churches, besides the Communion-Table, in one of the lesser recesses or *conchas* of the *bema*, there was a place where the offerings of the people were received, out of which the Bread and Wine was taken that was consecrated at the Altar. In the Liturgies under the names of Chrysostom, and St James, and other modern Greek writers, this is called *προthesis*, and *παράπροπτερον*, the *Side-Table*. In the *Ordo Romanus* it has the name of *Oblationarium*, and *Prothesis* also, for the one is made the explication of the other. And here also it is termed *paratorium*, because, when the offerings were received, preparation was made out of them for the Eucharist. There is little question to be made but that the ancient Churches had something answerable to this, but it went under other names; for we never meet with a *prothesis*, or *paratorium*, or *oblationarium*, in express terms in any ancient writer. But the thing itself we often find. CYPRIAN seems to speak of it under the borrowed name of the *corban* (*De Opere et Eleemos.* p. 203.).... In the 4th Council of Carthage (Canon 93.) this place goes by the general name of the *Sacrarium* or *Sanctuary*.... PAULINUS is more exact in describing this place than any other ancient writer, yet he gives it a different name, calling it one of the *Secretaria* of the Church. (*Ep.* 12. *ad Sever.* p. 154.)—*Antiq. of Christian Church*, VIII. c. 6. §. 22.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742.) observes:—'In the ancient Church, they had generally a *Side-Table* near the Altar, upon which the Elements were laid till the first part of the Communion-Service was over, at which the Catechumens were allowed to be present; but when they were gone, the Elements were removed and placed upon the holy Altar itself, with a solemn prayer. (*Lit. Chrys.*). Now though we have no *Side-Table* authorized by our Church: yet in the first Common Prayer of King Edward VI., the Priest himself was ordered in this place to set both the Bread and Wine upon the Altar.' (p. 272.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

Of more modern date, we have these opinions following:—

The BISHOP OF DURHAM (*Dr. Maltby*), in answer to certain complaints made concerning the Church of *Heworth*, thus decided with respect to a '*Credence-Table*':—'A *stone-Table*, and two stone Chairs or Sedilia, have been placed without competent authority, on the south side of the Communion-Table. I hereby order and direct that the same be forthwith removed.'—*Eccles. Gazette*, September. 1852. p. 69.

The BISHOP OF CALCUTTA (*Dr. Wilson*) declares:—'I prohibit altogether Stone-Altars, *Credence-Tables*, and other Popish usages in this Diocese.' (p. 73.)—*Farewell Charge*. 1845.

The REV. J. W. HEWETT, commenting upon the *Rubric*, says:—'This *Rubric* naturally suggests the question, whence is

'the Priest to take these Elements? Our Chancels remaining as 'in times past, answer, from the "*Credence-Table*." This piece 'of furniture, which we find in the shape of a *small wooden Table*, a *pillar*, or *corbel bracket*, or a *recess* in the wall, was 'called in the ancient Church, *πρόθεσις, παρατρέπον, oblationarium*. The latter name explains its use, for the oblations of 'the people were all laid upon it, and then so much taken from 'them as was necessary for the celebration of the Eucharist....If 'the Priest does not remove them from the *Credence-Table*, he 'must, to obey the Rubric, bring them from the Vestry.' (p. 10).—*Arrang. of Par. Churches*.

DR. HOOK defines the word thus:—'*CREDENCE*, a *table*, or '*shelf*' near the Altar, on which the BREAD and WINE to be used in 'the Eucharist are placed, previously to consecration, called in the 'Greek Church *τραπέζα προθέσεως, mensa propositiois*. The 'word '*Credence*' appears to be derived from the Italian '*credenzare*,' to taste before-hand the meats and drink before they 'were offered to be enjoyed by another; an ancient court practice, 'which was performed by the cup-bearers and carvers, who for this 'reason were also called "*credenzer*." Hence also the '*Credentz-teller*'—*credence-plate*, on which cup-bearers *credenced* the Wine; 'and in general, a plate on which a person offers anything to 'another: '*credenz tische*,' *credence-table*, a *side-board*, an artificial cup-board with a table for the purpose of arranging in 'order and keeping the drinking apparatus therein. (See ADELUNG'S *Germ. Diet. verh. "credenzen"*). This Table or shelf is 'used for the more convenient observance of the *Rubric* following the Offertory Sentences, in which it is directed: "*And when &c.*" 'Where the staff of the Clergy is large, the Rubric can be conveniently observed without this aid. There are many *Credences* 'in various Churches; among others, in the Collegiate and in 'St John's Churches, Manchester; and in the parish Church at 'Ludlow; where they have been in use from time immemorial.'—*Church Dict.*

The REV. J. JEBB observes:—'The Priest is expressly enjoined 'not to place the BREAD and WINE upon the Table till after the 'Alms are collected; as is evident by the words, "*after which done, the Priest shall say &c.*" He is also enjoined to do this *himself*. And such was the ancient custom of the Church. The BREAD 'and WINE was brought out from a side Chapel, from the *Table of prothesis*, by the Deacons, and then placed on the Altar by the 'Priest. From ABP. LAUD'S testimony, it appears that in his time 'in Lambeth Chapel, the Elements were fetched from a *Credential*, '(a little *Side-Table*, as they called it), and set then reverently 'upon the Communion-Table." And he adds, that "BP. ANDREWES, and some other Bishops, used it so all in their time 'and no exception taken." The author was informed some years 'ago, that a *Credential*, used for this purpose, formerly stood in 'Salisbury Cathedral. The occurrence of one, however, is very 'rare. And it is to be doubted whether there is not a closer 'analogy to primitive practice observed by bringing the Elements 'from the Vestry, which answers to the ancient *Chapel of Prothesis*.' (p. 498).—*Choral Service*.



The REV. G. A. POOLE remarks:—‘The *Credence*, or *Prothesis*, is simply a Table for the reception of the Elements before their oblation on the Christian Altar. Either this Table, or some substitute for it, is still necessary, or at least convenient for the service of the Altar. For want of it, it has become far too common to omit one of the very important requirements of the Rubric in the Communion-Service.... Now instead of the Rubric above cited being respected, it is in general disobeyed in all its parts. The BREAD and WINE are not placed on the Table by the Priest after the Offertory, but by some one else, no one knows or cares when, and by whom... With respect to the use of the *Credence*, or *Prothesis*, in the Collegiate Church of Manchester, there has been one from time immemorial, which is always used, and the same may be said of the *Credence* in Ludlow Church. The introduction and use of the *Credence* are now becoming common in new Churches. There could be no more convenient and graceful form for the *Credence*, than the *fenestella* over the *Piscina*.’ In a *Note* is added:—‘The *Credence* at Manchester is a wooden Table, unfixed, and furnished with a leaf, which is left down except at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. The *tapestry*, which forms hangings behind the Altar and the *Credence*, was presented to the Church in the year 1706.’ (p. 109.)—*Churches their Structure and Arrangement*.

The REV. J. E. RIDDLE remarks:—‘On one side of the Altar, (usually on the right) stood the *παράτραπεζον*, *mensula*, i. e. *Side-Table*; sometimes called also *προθεσις*, *paratorium*, *oblatorium*, and sometimes *sacrarium*, or *secretarium*, on which the oblations were placed after they had been collected by the Deacons, before the beginning of the Eucharist.’ (p. 721.)—*Christian Antiq.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON merely observes:—‘A question arises—whence is the Priest to take the Elements before placing them? A *Credence* or *Side-Table* was used by ANDREWES, LAUD, and other Divines of the same school, and was objected to as an innovation in 1641. (RUSHW. ii. 280. CARDWELL’S *Conf.* 273.) SPARROW conceives that this article of furniture may be implied or sanctioned by the Rubric which directs that “Chancels shall remain as in times past.” (Ration. 305.)’—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.* p. 201.

The late SIR HERBERT JENNER FUST—in his judgment in the *Stone-Altar* case of *Faulkner v. Litchfield and Stearne*, Chws. of the Round Church, (The Holy Sepulchre), Cambridge (*Jan.* 31, 1845.), thus speaks of the *Credence-Table*:—‘With respect to the *Credence-Table*, I do not find sufficient information to enable me to judge when these Tables were first introduced. It is clear that they were in use in the English Churches before the time of ABP. LAUD, because he refers to his use of one as an article of accusation against him, and justifies himself by representing that the Table had been used by his predecessors, and, amongst others, by BP. ANDREWES; but it was considered, that this was strong proof of his desire to introduce Popish rites and ceremonies. The derivation of the term ‘*Credence-Table*’ is referred to the Italian language, and it is said to mean what ABP. LAUD calls it, a ‘*Side-Board*.’ The question is not of much importance; but in

'ADELUNG'S *German Dictionary* we have the following definition of the word: "*Credenzen*, from &c." (quoted by DR. HOOK, see above p. 606.) 'I am of opinion that the *Credence-Table* must follow the same principle as the other; for, though in use in the Greek and Latin Churches, it forms no part of the *ittings-up* of our Churches, and is not to be considered a Communion-Table, or part of a Communion-Table, in the proper meaning of the term.'—(quoted in STEPHENS' *Ecccl. Statutes*, p. 2075.).

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says:—'There is not any authority in the RUBRIC, or Ecclesiastical CANONS, for the use of a *Credence-Table*.' (p. 289.).—*Laws Rel. to Clergy*.

In the HIERURGIA ANGLICANA, among the furniture of BP. ANDREWES'S Chapel, is mentioned:—'The *Sier* or *Side-Table*, or *Credentia*, on which the Wafer Canister, and the Tonne or Flagon, 'were placed.' (p. 8, 9. See also p. 346.).

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA gives illustrations of a *Credence-Table*—(1) 'from the Hospital Church of S. Cross, Hampshire, where it stands on the south side of the Altar. It is attached to the walls on its east and south sides. The north side and the west are free. The slab measures on the top 3 ft. 11½ in. × 1 ft. 5½ in.—(2) a *Credence-Niche*, in the north wall of the Chancel of S. Leonard's, South-Cockerington, Lincolnshire. It is situated 3 ft. from the east end:—(3) is an original design, adapted partly from the *Credence-Niche* at S. Mary's, Cobham. It there measures 2 ft. 5½ in. from the floor to the top of the bracket.'—PLATE 10.

The QUARTERLY REVIEW, after speaking of the customary mode of placing the BREAD and WINE (as quoted in p. 574), thus proceeds:—'But the other mode, and that adopted, as we hear, by the high Tractarians, is the placing a relique of Popery\* almost forgotten amongst us, called a *Credence-Table*—that is, a *side table*, within the Rails close to the Communion-Table, on which the Elements are placed (but still we suppose by the Clerk or Sexton) before the Service. They may then be, we will suppose, conveniently and decently reached by the Priest, and by him offered reverently at the Table. But then, observing that all this new ceremony is introduced for a more exact compliance with the RUBRIC, we are entitled to ask what Rubrical authority there is for this *Side-Table*? There is none; and when you come to be exact in such a case, silence is prohibition. We will not enter into the doctrinal question of how far the laying the Elements on the Table is an *oblation*;...if the BREAD and WINE be an *oblation*, they are neither more nor less an *oblation* when they are presented for Sacramental purposes on the *Credence-Table*, than when they were placed under a napkin on the Communion-Table. But again:—in what shape are the Elements to be presented on the *Credence Table*; is the WINE to

---

\* In a Note is added:—'Any one who will take the trouble of reading the formula of an Episcopal Mass in the Romish Church, will see to what symbolical and superstitious mummeries the *Credence* is subservient.'

'be in a *Bottle*, and the BREAD in a *Loaf*?' &c. (already quoted in p. 563.)....'We are decidedly of opinion that the usage and precedent which have, time out of mind, prevailed in this matter, are more convenient, more decent, more reverent, and not further from the letter of the Rubric, than either of the recent practices of using the *Vestry*, as a 'pantry,' or the setting out the Elements of the Lord's Supper on a *Side-Board*.' (In a *Note* is added the following explanation of '*Side-Board*'—'Literally a *side-board* or *cup-board*—"*Tabula seu mensa in qua vasa ad convivium reponuntur, vel etiam mensula qua vasa altaris con- tinent.*"—DU CANGE. "*Credence*," says MENAGE, "*signifie un buffet*.")—No. cxliii. *May*. 1843. p. 266.

After perusing the above opinions, there can be little doubt but that the introduction of a '*Credence-Table*' is illegal; and would in many cases, if persevered in, be attended with mischievous consequences.

### [The Cross.]

The use of the *Cross* for merely ornamental purposes has latterly been revived amongst us, and prevails very extensively in the decorations of our modern Churches. This circumstance would lead to the inference that its introduction has obtained the tacit sanction, if not expressed permission, of Episcopal authority: it certainly does not appear to have incurred much popular objection. The *Cross* is particularly prominent in the embellishments of the furniture of the Communion-Table, especially the '*Cross fleurè*' (with *fleur-de-lis* finials), and others of the like kind having the four limbs of equal length. Occasionally, the *Cross of Calvary*, or Latin Cross, may be seen in the Chancel standing out in 'bold relief;' and in the CHURCH-YARD also the *Cross* is re-appearing on the head-stones, and on the coped grave-stones; and sometimes independently as a monument. Such application of this emblem has been considered by many unobjectionable. But when the *Cross* is set up, either within or without the Church, purposely to symbolize the Crucifixion, and to exact in consequence

a certain degree of reverence, it then assumes a very questionable character, and comes under the denomination of an 'Image;' its revival therefore in this form, although not actually proscribed by our existing RUBRICS, and CANONS, yet is in contravention of the doctrine and usage of the Reformed Church, as laid down in the *XXXIX Articles*, and in the *Homilies*. The possible, if not probable, result of such renewed usage of the *material Cross* in the present temper of the times, would be to awaken that strong feeling of antipathy on the part of the Congregation, which, if disregarded, may produce, as it has already done in certain cases, a storm of opposition, only to be allayed by a peremptory injunction from the Ordinary for the removal of the obnoxious symbol. It requires therefore a previous acquaintance with the feelings of the people before the display of such novelties, however innocent in themselves, should be hazarded: more especially, as we cannot discover any historical evidences which will serve to defend their introduction into our Churches. The admission of the *Crucifix* is, of course, out of all question.

In referring to the era of the Reformation we find popular clamour raised against the use of the *Cross*; particularly against what was then called the *Rood* (from the Saxon '*rode*,' a cross): this, says FOSBROKE in his *British Monachism*, was a carved or sculptured group, consisting of a *Crucifix*, or image of Christ on the Cross, with commonly the *Virgin Mary* on one side, and *St John* on the other; though for these were sometimes substituted the four Evangelists, and frequently rows of Saints were added on each side. The *Rood* was always placed on a beam or gallery extending across the Chancel Arch, between the Nave and the Choir; whence '*Rood-left*,' '*Rood-Screen*,' '*Holyrood*,' &c. The celebrated wonder-working *Rood* of Boxley in Kent, called the '*Rood of Grace*,' was destroyed in the reign of Henry VIII. (in 1537-8, according to STOW.)

In 1547-9. The *Injunctions* of Edward VI. commanded all *Crosses* and *Roods* to be taken down in consequence of the superstitious adoration offered to them. (See HEYLYN'S *Hist. of Ref.* E. II. S. i. 18, 84; CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 7. 17. 39. 42.)

In 1549: there was also an especial prohibition in the Visitation Articles of that time against the use of the *Cross* at FUNERALS; it thus reads:—'Item, to receive no corpse, hut at the Church-yard, without Bell, or *Cross*.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 64.

This was followed by the Act, 3 & 4 *Edw.* VI. c. 10. (A. D. 1549.) "For the Abolishing and Putting away divers Books and Images." (See 'IMAGES' *postea*); which BP. RIDLEY promptly acted upon, as we may judge from his Visitation Articles for the Diocese of London in 1550. Under the general appellation of 'Images' was ranked the *Cross*.—(*ib.* i. 80.).

On the accession of MARY all these, and such like orders, were of course repealed, and *Roods* zealously restored. BP. BONNER (in 1553.) was particularly active in ordering the *Rood-lofts* to be repaired, and the *Roods* to be set up again. (HEYLYN'S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. ii. 112; STOW, 627.)

In 1557. Cardinal POLE also, among his Articles of Inquiry issued throughout the province of Cauterbury, asks:—'Whether they have a *Rood* in their Church of a decent stature, with *Mary* and *John*, and an image of the *patron* of the same Church'.—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 173.

Yet when ELIZABETH came to the throne the Injunctions of Edward VI. for the abolishing of Images were not at first very stringently revived. The Royal Commissioners, however, appear to have had authority to remove *Images* and *Crosses* from Parish Churches. (HEYLYN'S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. ii. 303.).

In 1559. we find COX, *Bp. of Ely*, writing to the Queen on this subject, and saying among other things:—'I dare not minister in your Grace's Chapel, the *Lights* and *Cross* remaining.'—(STRYPE'S *Ann. App. No.* XXII. p. 51.); and in his letter to PETER MARTYR, at the close of this year, while expressing some satisfaction at the progress of the Reformation, COX says:—'Only we are compelled to tolerate in our Churches, to our great grief, the image of the *Cross*, and of the *Crucifix*.'—(*Zurich Lett.* Ep. 28. p. 28.). In 1559—60. SAMPSON also writes to PETER MARTYR to the same purport. (*ib.* Ep. 27. p. 36.).

Shortly after, a public disputation was held on the subject of the *Cross*, in which ABP. PARKER, and BP. COX, although not personally advocates of its use,—*Cardwell* however thinks COX's sentiments had undergone a change (*Doc. Ann.* i. 236.),—were deputed to bring forward arguments in defence of it, while GRINDAL, and JEWEL, were to adduce reasons in opposition. JEWEL the day before, thus expressed himself to PETER MARTYR:—'Things have come to that pass, that either the silver and tin *Crosses*, which we have every where broken to pieces, must be restored, or our Bishopricks relinquished.' (*Zurich Lett.* Ep. 29. p. 39.). The issue of the disputation was that all *Crosses* and *Crucifixes* were to be removed from Parish Churches. Still, as STRYPE says:—'It is certain, however, these *Crucifixes* and *Roods* (*Crosses*) were taken down by Authority, yet the *Crucifix* remained in the Queen's Chapel afterwards.' (*Ann.* p. 174.). But from BP. SANDY'S letter to PETER MARTYR (April 1,

1560.) there is evidence that *Crosses* were eventually removed from the Royal Chapel: for he says:—‘There only remain in our Church those Popish *vestments* (I mean *Copes*), which we hope ‘will not continue long.’—(*Zurich. Lett. Ep.* 31. p. 43.)

ABP. PARKER used all his influence to prevail upon the Queen to dispense with the *Crucifix*, and for a time he was successful: but *Elizabeth* would occasionally yield to her old prejudices, and re-introduce it. (STRYPE'S *Parker*, p. 310.) This is confirmed by Letters from BP. PARKHURST to BULLINGER, in one of which (in 1562.) he speaks of ‘the massy silver *Crucifix*’ in the Royal Chapel having been demolished, at the instigation of Sir Francis Knolles, by PASCH, the Queen’s fool. (*Zurich Lett. Ep.* 53; HEYLYN’S *Ref. E. H. S.* ii. 316.). In the year following, PARKHURST deploras the restoration of the Lights and the *Cross* in the Queen’s Chapel. (*Zur. Lett. Ep.* 57.).

In 1561. in the *Orders* taken the 10th dsy of October in the 3rd year of the reign of Elizabeth &c., the first enjoins:—‘It is ‘thus decreed and ordained, that the *Rood-lofts*, as yet being at ‘this day aforesaid untransposed, shall be so altered that the ‘upper part of same with the sollar be quite taken down &c.’—*Brit. Mag.* Oct. 1848. p. 419—21; HEYLYN’S *Hist. of Ref. E. H. S.* ii. 361. n.

BP. JEWEL in his reply to HARDING, (1565) where the latter refers to the *sign of the Cross* seen by Constantine the Great, and its subsequent display on Flags and Banners, thus observes:—‘It is ‘not hitherto any way proved, either that this *Cross* was an image, ‘or that it was set up in any Church, or that it was adored of the ‘people....Seeing therefore none of all these *Crosses* that M. ‘HARDING hath here found out, either had any image hanging on ‘it, or was erected in any Church, or adored of the people, how can ‘all these words stand him in stead to serve his purpose.’ (*Works*, fol. p. 372.)

In 1571. The Canons of that time enjoined upon Churchwardens:—‘Moreover they shall see that all *Rood-lofts* in which ‘wooden *Crosses* stood, and all other relics of superstition be clean ‘taken away.’\*—CARDWELL’S *Synod.* i. 123; SPARROW’S *Coll.* 235.

GRINDAL, *Abp. of York*, issued among his Injunctions of this date, the following:—‘Item, that the Churchwardens and Minister ‘shall see...that all...Censers, Chrismatories, *Crosses*, Candlesticks, ‘holy-water stocks, or fat *Images*, and all other relics and monuments ‘of superstition and idolatry be utterly defaced, broken, and de- ‘stroyed’. (*Works*, 135.). And, ‘*Rood-lofts* altered, the materials ‘to be sold to the use of the Church.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 336.

In 1576, when *Abp. of Canterbury*, GRINDAL inquires:—‘Whether throughout the province those things above mentioned ‘have been utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed.’ (*Works*, 159.).

---

\* ‘*Editui* curshunt ut omnia illa *soloria*, in quibus *crucēs* ‘*lignæ* aliquando prostabant, et *aliæ* reliquæ superstitionis prorsus ‘e medio auferantur.’—SPARROW’S *Coll.* p. 235.

In 1574. ABP. WHITGIFT writes:—‘As for Papists, we are far enough off from them, for they pictured the *sign of the cross* and did worship it, so do not we....they had it in their Churches so have not we.’ (p. 616.)....‘As there is great difference betwixt the painting of an image, to set forth a history, and placing of it in the Church to be worshipped, so is there also as great difference, or more, betwixt *crossing* a Child in the forehead at the time of Baptism, with expressing the cause and use of it, and the placing of *Crosses* in Churches, or Highways, and Streets. The *crossing* of the Child’s forehead is but for a moment, the *Cross* of wood and stone remaineth and continueth: the *Cross* in the Child’s forehead is not made to be adored and worshipped, neither was ever any man so mad as to imagine any such thing of it: but the *Crosses* in Churches, Streets, and Highways, of metal and wood, were erected to be worshipped, and were so accordingly, and therefore there is no like peril in the one as there is in the other.’ (p. 619).—*Defence of the Answer to the Admonition.*

In 1603, at the *Hampton Court Conference*, JAMES I. arguing with respect to the *sign of the cross*, remarks:—‘You see that the material *Crosses*, which in time of Popery were made for men to fall down before them, as they passed by them, to worship them, (as the idolatrous Jews did the Brazen Serpent) are demolished as you desire.’—CARDWELL’S *Conf.* (p. 200.).

The following additional opinions may be serviceable.

BINGHAM, alluding to ancient usage, states:—‘When *Crosses* came first to be set up in Churches is not so easy to be determined. That they were not in use for the three first ages, seems evident enough from the silence of all the writers of those times, and from Eusebius, who has frequent occasion to describe minutely the Churches of Constantine and others, but never once mentions a *Cross* erected in them, though he speaks frequently of *Crosses* set up in other public places, as a learned writer (*Dallens*) has judiciously observed out of him, who thinks they began not to be set up in Churches till after the year 340. *Chrysostom* speaks... not of any material *Cross* set upon the Altar. But *Sozomen* speaks of material *Crosses* lying upon the Altar, though not in the time of Constantine, (as *Gretzer* mistakes, whose error is justly corrected by *Valesius*), but in his own time. And after him *Evagrius* speaks of silver *Crosses* given by Chosroes to one of the Churches of Constantinople to be fixed upon the Altar. So that the original of this custom is not to be deduced from Constantine, as many suppose, but from the following ages of the Church.’—*Antiq. of Chr. Church*, VIII. c. 6. §. 20.

The REV. C. BENSON (late *Master of the Temple*) remarks:—‘Why should the *Cross*, which some are now placing above the Communion-Table, and towards which, as being at the east end of the Church, they wish all Prayers to be directed, escape this “inseparable accident” of worship “being done after an image”? Has experience shown the present generation, either of Clergy or Laymen, to be above the danger of superstition?’ (p. 12. n.)—*On Rubrics & Canons.*

DR. CARDWELL, speaking of the predilection of Elizabeth,

says:—‘She was known still to be favourable to the use of *Crosses* and *Crucifixes*, and they continued to be exhibited not merely in her own Chapel, but also in many of the Churches.’... (After referring to the correspondence we have above quoted from the *Zurich Letters*, he adds) ‘The question however was soon afterwards set at rest by the complete *removal of Crosses*: as appears from a letter written by BP. SANDYS to PETER MARTYR on April 1st, 1560.’—*Doc. Ann.* i. 235.

The REV. W. GOODE, referring to the Statute of 3 & 4 *Edw.* VI. c. 10. against ‘divers Books, and Images,’ observes:—‘Of course, the *Crucifix* was included in the prohibition; and also the *Cross*, as having been the object of worship and adoration.’ (p. 50.) He then quotes from a Letter of COX, Bp. of Ely, to Queen Elizabeth, and from the *Homily* ‘Against Peril of Idolatry.’ In respect of the argument in the latter Mr. GOODE adds:—‘I need hardly observe, that although the *Cross*, as distinguished from the *Crucifix*, is not here specially named, it is included in the argument of the Homily, on account of the worship that has been rendered to it.’ (p. 58.). To this is annexed as a *Note* these words:—‘I conceive that there is a marked distinction between the *Cross* as used on the exterior of a Church as an *Ecclesiastical emblem*, or otherwise in places or under circumstances where it is not likely to be the object of worship, and as placed on the *Communion-Table* or elsewhere within a Church, in an isolated form, for the evident purpose of its being made an object of religious reverence, or, to those so disposed, of adoration.’ (*ib.*).... After proceeding to extract several passages from the *Zurich Letters* we have above referred to, the Author goes on to say:—‘The use of the *Crucifix* was retained by the Queen (Elizabeth) for several years; and to this one exception probably it is owing that the *Crucifix*, or at least the *Cross*, stealthily maintained its ground in a few Churches, and was afterwards revived in various Churches by the *Laudian* party in the next century.’ (p. 68.). After producing further historical evidences in proof of the prohibition of *Crosses*, &c. he at length concludes:—‘The doctrine of our Church on this subject, therefore, is beyond question. Nor does the attempt of the *Laudian* Bishops in the middle of the 17th century to revive the use of *Crosses*, &c., in our Churches, (which was defended greatly by the example set in the Royal Chapel, and other privileged places) at all shake the argument against it grounded upon the authorities and testimonies given above; and therefore of their proceedings no notice need be taken.’ (p. 75.).—*Cer. of Church of England.*

In the *HIERURGIA ANGLICANA* are several notices of the use of the *Cross*, and *Crucifix* in the Royal Chapels of ELIZABETH, and of CHARLES I.; in Cathedrals, and Universities; as well as in a few Parish Churches in the time of CHARLES I. between A. D. 1625 and 1644: to which work, we would refer the Reader, who seeks for further examples.

In our own time we have a very prominent instance of the introduction of the *material Cross* upon the Communion-Table; which not only called for Episcopal prohibition, but entailed upon the introducer such Ecclesiastical censures as to set the question



definitively at rest. The 'case' (in part) we have before referred to in our preliminary discussion respecting the supply of ORNAMENTS generally; and the portion there quoted should be read *previously* to what follows. (*supra*, p. 480.).

The argument of the BP. OF EXETER in so far as it relates to the *Cross*, is here continued:—and we will merely preface the extract by observing that the Charge brought against the *Rev. W. G. Parks Smith* (28th May, 1847.) involved two questions, viz.:—‘Placing upon the Communion-Table *two glass Vases containing Flowers*, and a *Cross* about 2-ft. high *decked with flowers*.’ With regard to the *Cross* the BP. OF EXETER (*Dr. Phillpotts*) thus remarked:—‘If the claim of primitive usage could prevail in favour of *decoration with flowers*, certainly no such pretension can be set up for the use of the *Cross*, as an Ornament of the Sacramental Table. Such a thing was never heard of, during more than the first three centuries of the Christian *Æra*; and DURANDUS, the authority relied on by the Defendant’s advocate, for saying, that “the proper place for the *Cross* is the Lord’s Table,” was a Bishop and a Canonist of the 13th century; therefore very little entitled to our attention on a question respecting the present law of our Church, even if the reasons stated by him, were as solid, as they are in truth, shadowy and unsatisfactory. His principal reason is this:—“The *Cross* on the Altar is placed in the middle, between the two Candlesticks, because Christ in the Church is the Mediator between the two peoples (the Jews and the Gentiles), for he is the corner-stone making of both one.” I abstain from discussing this reason; nor should I have mentioned it, did it not suggest a very strong presumption, that the *Cross* was not retained on the Holy Table, by authority of Parliament, in the 2nd year of King Edward VI.; for in the Royal Injunctions set forth in that year (the document referred to), while there is an express order, that the two Candlesticks be retained (though for a very different reason from that which DURANDUS gives, and one with which the *Cross* has no concern, viz. “that Christ is the very true light of the World”), there is not a word respecting the *Cross*; surely, therefore, the *Cross* is not there retained. And, if any doubt could remain, it would be removed by another passage of those Injunctions, in which, there being an express condemnation, of “whosoever doth superstitiously abuse ceremonies to the great peril and danger of their soul’s health,” one of the instances specified is “making of *Crosses* of wood upon Palm Sunday, in time of reading of the Passion”—a time, when, if ever, the exhibition of a *Cross* should seem peculiarly appropriate.”—The Bishop, after referring to the Injunctions of ABP. GRINDAL in 1571, and 1576 (given above p. 612.) draws from them this inference with respect to the *Cross*, that it could not have been among the Ornaments which, only 12 years before, and under the same sovereign, Queen Elizabeth, were ordered by Statute to “be retained and be in use,” because they “were in the Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the 2nd year of the reign of King Edward VI.” The truth is, that however reasonable, significant, and affecting, the *material image of the Cross*, in itself, is, the gross abuses which had prevailed respecting it, not only rendered the use of it in Divine Service utterly intolerable, but caused, as is notorious, very strong

‘and lasting prejudices to prevail against even the transient image of it, made in the air, after the undisputed usage of Christian antiquity....Such having been the wise and charitable course deliberately adopted by the governors of our Church, it is surely not too much to expect and demand, that no individual Clergyman should presume to traverse it....For what must be the consequences of a different course on his part? could the sudden and unauthorized reappearance of a *Cross* on the Lord’s Table—prepared, as in the present case that Table was, for the celebration of the highest and the holiest mysteries—could it fail to give very grave and very reasonable offence? Must not such a spectacle have excited in many minds feelings of displeasure—it may be something akin to anger—ill according with that holy calmness and composure, which it must have been the wish, as it was the duty, of all, at such a season, to seek to cherish? Could a sober minded Minister of God’s Word and Sacraments voluntarily do any thing likely to lead to this result? It is impossible. Mr. Smith, I am sure, did not perceive, manifest as we may deem it, the danger which he incurred. He only saw, or thought he saw, in this exhibition of a *Cross*, something peculiarly appropriate to a Sacrament, in which “we do show the Lord’s death till he come.”....Again, the *Cross*, man’s invention, looks only to the crucified body—the body in its utmost humiliation: Christ’s ordinance regards the body, not in its humiliation only; but also, and chiefly, in its glory....In truth, therefore, the outward, the *material Cross* is peculiarly unfitted to be placed in contact with the sacramental symbols. Instead of exciting the mind to due contemplation of the triumphant issue of our Lord’s sufferings, it tends to chain it down to the sufferings themselves....In the exhibition of the *Cross* on the Lord’s Table, we have only a fresh instance of the foolishness of man’s wisdom, when it seeks to improve, or to add to, the institution of Christ himself....In conclusion, as there is no ground on which the act, admitted by Mr. Smith, can be deemed lawful, it is my duty to adjudge that he be admonished, and I do now admonish him, not again to offend in the like manner; and I further order that he pay the costs of these proceedings.”—(quoted in STEPHEN’S *B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 1109; *Laws Rel. to Ch.* p. 1083.)

In the INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA it is remarked with respect to the ‘*Altar-Cross*’:—‘This has been too generally superseded on our Altars by the *Offertory-Basin*. Very ancient illuminations represent Altars with plain *metal Crosses* on them. It is well known, having been proved in the ‘*HIERURGIA ANGLICANA*,’ that the use of even *Crucifixes* on our Altars was retained after the Reformation in Royal Chapels and other places, as it is to this day in Lutheran places of worship abroad. But there is little doubt that a *plain metal Cross* has the earlier authority, and is most to be recommended. The *jewelled Crosses* represented, sometimes on Altars, in the ancient Mosaics at Rome, will occur to some of our Readers. The four extremities of the arms are properly occupied by the Evangelistic Symbols.’—PLATE 59.

## [Evergreens, and Flowers.]

It is a practice in most Parishes, in the country especially, to decorate the Church at CHRISTMAS time with *Evergreens*: and, in many places, at EASTER with *branches of trees*, and with *flowers*. There are instances likewise of this usage being practised on the day of the *Village wake* or *feast*, or on some other annual festival peculiar to a locality. If the *custom* has long prevailed, and its harmlessness acknowledged, there can be no reason why it should be dispensed with; but where the practice forms a completely new and studied feature, or the season chosen be unusual, or the decoration symbolical, and confined to the Communion-Table, it then becomes an innovation of that character, which is likely to startle the people by its novelty, and will produce remonstrance and resistance. We need hardly say that when such objections arise they must be removed, or the practice forborne; besides which, it must be stated, that since this usage, with respect to Easter, cannot be defended by any Ecclesiastical *Law*, or *Canon*, or by general custom, no individual Clergyman possesses authority to introduce it. Where, however, the use of *Evergreens* and *Flowers* has been admitted, time out of mind, at either of these seasons, their arrangement in the Church should not be left to the PARISH CLERK, and SEXTON; but rather to the more cultivated taste of the Incumbent, and Churchwardens, whose reverential feelings and better judgment will take care that it be effected with the simplicity and propriety due to the House of God. Still, it must not be forgotten that we derive the idea of these ramose and floral embellishments of our Places of Worship from Pagan usage; probably, from the ancient *Satur-*

*nalìa* of Rome,\* combined with the *Yule-tide* ceremonies of our Saxon Ancestors, and certain rites of Druidism, or of Northern mythology.

These decorations, where they are customary, are usually put up at CHRISTMAS-EVE, and remain till *Twelfth-Night*: in some Parishes they are suffered to continue till *Septuagesima-Sunday*, but not later.

It may be observed here, that *Flags* and *Garlands* cannot be placed upon, or about, the CHURCH, or CHURCH-YARD, on public occasions without the consent of the Minister, and Churchwardens. (See pages 500, 505.).

We will now adduce a few opinions; and at the same time we cannot but regret, that our historical information on the use of *Evergreens*, and *Flowers*, of any authority, is too scanty to be of very essential service.

BINGHAM, after speaking of images and paintings, remarks:—  
 ‘There was one way more of adorning Churches, which I should  
 ‘not have thought worth mentioning, but for its innocency and  
 ‘natural simplicity; that is, the custom of garnishing and decking  
 ‘them with *Flowers* and *Branches*. Which was not done at any  
 ‘certain times for any pretended mystery, but only to make them  
 ‘more decent and fit for a body of men to meet in. ST AUSTIN  
 ‘takes notice of the custom, speaking of one who carried away  
 ‘with him some *Flowers* from off the Altar. (AUG. *de Civ. Dei.*  
 ‘xxii. 8.). And PAULINUS, in his poetical way, refers to it likewise—

---

\* HOSPINIAN, who flourished about A. D. 514., supposes that the Festivals of *Christ's Nativity*, and the *Epiphany*, were instituted chiefly with the view of opposing the vanities and excesses which the heathen practised upon their *Saturnalia*, and *Kalends of January*, at this time of the year. (p. 111.)—*De Festis Christianorum*. Tigur. 1593. fol. Every Classical student is aware that *branches of trees*, *garlands*, and *wreaths of flowers* composed with reference to the peculiar divinity intended to be honoured, were suspended over the doors of the temples, palaces, and private houses, at certain Festivals, and times of public thanksgiving. (TIB. I. i. 21: OVID. *Met.* I. 562; OV. *Trist.* III. i. 35—49; PLIN. H. N. XV. 39; SEN. *Cons. ad Polyb.* 35; VAL. MAX. II. 8. 7.). Similarly at MARRIAGES appeared the *Laurel*, and *Myrtle*. (JUV. VI. 79, 228; CLAUD. *de Nup. Hon. et Mar.* 208: CATUL. *Epith.* Pel. et Thet. 278—293). So at the BIRTH of a child, (JUV. IX. 84.); and the *Cypress* at DEATHS. (PLIN. H. N. XVI. 60; SERV. in *Virg. Æn.* III. 64.). See also JUVENAL XII. 92; and POTTER's *Antiq.*; SMITH's *Greek and Rom. Antiquities*.

"*Ferte Deo pueri laudem pia solvite vota : spargite flore solum, prætexite limina sertis.*"—(PAULIN. *Natal.* 3. *Felicitis.* p. 541.).—But ST JEROM does it the greatest honour, to give it a place in his panegyric upon his friend NEPOTIAN, making it a part of his commendable character that he took care &c....and so far did his pious solicitude about these matters extend, that he made flowers, and leaves, and branches of trees contribute to the beauty and ornaments of the Churches. ("Erat sollicitus &c....*Basilicas ecclesiæ et martyrum conciliabula diversis floribus et arborum comis, vitiumque pampinis adumbravit.*" HIERON. Ep. 3. *Epit. Nep.*). These were but small things in themselves, ST JEROM says, but a pious mind devoted to Christ is intent upon things great and small, and neglects nothing that may deserve the name of the very meanest office in the Church. And it is plain ST JEROM had a greater value for such sort of natural beauty and comeliness in Churches, than for rich ornaments' &c.—*Antiq. of Christian Church* viii. 8. §. 12. (RIDDLE in his *Christian Antiq.* (p. 742.) refers to the same authorities: and DR. HOOK likewise quotes St Jerome's remark on *Nepotian* in his *Church Dict.* Art. 'FLOWERS.')

GEORGE HERBERT (*ob.* 1632.) recommends:—"That the Church be swept and kept clean, without dust or cobwebs, and at great Festivals strewed and stuck with boughs, and perfumed with incense."—*Country Parson* (in *Clergyman's Instr.* 3rd. ed. p. 56.).

The HERURGIA ANGLICANA supplies several examples of this kind of Church decoration: first as to CHRISTMAS.—'In 1635. FERRAR's Chapel at Little Gidding was in general fairly and sweetly adorned with herbs and flowers, natural in some places, and artificial, upon every pillar, &c.' (WORDSW. *Ecc. B.* v. 257).—In 1712, a correspondent in "*The Spectator*" says, her Parish Church as it is now equipped, looks more like a Green-house than a Place of Worship. The middle aisle is a very pretty shady walk, and the Pews look like so many arbours on each side of it. The Pulpit itself has such clusters of ivy, holly and rosemary about it, that &c.' (*Spectator* No. 282.)—At EASTER...That: 'The flowers, with which many Churches are ornamented on EASTER-DAY, are most probably intended as emblems of the Resurrection, having just risen again from the earth, in which, during the severity of the winter, they seem to have been buried.' (*Gent's Mag.* vol. iii. 578.—At FESTIVALS....'Rush-bearing, or carrying rushes to the Churches, and there strewing them, was a custom which formerly prevailed generally in Cheshire; but has been much disused for many years, since close Pews have been erected in most Churches. It took place on the day of the Wake, and was attended with a procession of young men and women, dressed in ribands, and carrying garlands, &c, which were hung up in the Church....In the north of England, among the Lakes, and at a Rural Festival called Rush-bearing Sunday, the Churches are decorated with flowers and rushes. (FABER'S *Serm. in Bk. of Fragments* p. 86, 87.)—'At Charlton-on-Otmoor, on the Rood-loft a garland is placed from immemorial custom on MAY-DAY, strung upon a wooden cross, which remains in the position of the ancient Holy-Rood until the following year, when the Flowers and Evergreens are again renewed.' (*Guide to Arch. Antiq. of Oxford.* 1842.)—

'At *St James's*, Enfield High-way, on the Festival of *St. JAMES*, the Church was hung with *garlands*: and numerous Banners with religious devices were ranged along the Western gallery.' (*English Churchman*).—On *PALM-SUNDAY*. . . 'In 1797; It is yet the custom at King's Cliff, in Northamptonshire, to stick the Church with *Palms* on Passion-Sunday.' (*Ill. of Manners, and Exp. of Ancient Times in Eng.* p. 319.)—In 1575; On Queen Elizabeth's visit to *St Lawrence's Church*, Reading, . . . the Pulpit was then ornamented with a new cloth, and the Church was strewn with *Flowers*. (*Book of Fragments*. p. 33.)—pp. 180—186. pub. by the *Ecclesiological Society*.

BRAND (*oh.* 1806) says:—"This custom, the Christians appear to have copied from their Pagan ancestors. BOURNE in his *Antiquities of the Common People* (p. 173.) cites the Council of *Bracara*, Canon 73. as forbidding Christians to deck their Houses with *Bay-leaves* and *green boughs*, but this extended only to their doing it at the same time with the Pagans.—"Non liceat iniquas observantias agere Kalendarum et oclis vacare Gentilibus, neque lauro, neque viriditate arborum cingere domos. Omnis enim hæc observatio Paganismi est." *Bra. Can.* 73. *Instell.*—PRYNNE in his *Histrio-Mastix*, p. 581. cites nearly the same words from the 73rd Canon of the "*Consilium Antisiodorense*," in France. A. D. 614. In the same work, p. 21., he cites Councils as forbidding the early Christians "to decke up their houses with lawrell, yvie, and greene boughes (as we used to doe in the Christmas Season)." Adding from OVID. (*Fæst. lib.* III.). "Hædera est gratissima Baccho." Compare also TERTULL. *de Idol.* c. 15.—"Trimmyng of the Temples," says POLYDORE VERGIL (*Langley's Transl.* fol. 100. b.) "with hangynges, floures, boughes, and garlondes, was taken of the heathen people, whiche decked their idols and Houses with such array." DR. CHANDLER tells us that "where Druidism prevailed the Houses were decked with *Evergreens in December*, that the Sylvan Spirits might repair to them, and remain unnnipped with frost and cold winds until a milder season had renewed the foliage of their darling abodes." STOW, in his *Survey of London*, says that "against the Feast of *Christmas* every man's House, as also their *Parish Churches*, were decked with holme, ivy, hayes, and whatsoever the season of the year afforded to be green."—BOURNE says "this custom is seldom used in the North; but in the South, particularly at our Universities, it is very common to deck not only the common windows of the Town, but also the *Chapels of the Colleges* with branches of *Laurel*, which was used by the ancient Romans as the emblem of Peace, Joy, and Victory. In the Christian sense it may be applied to the victory gained over the Powers of Darkuess by the coming of Christ."—In the ancient *Calendar* of the Church of Rome I find the following observation on *Christmas-Eve*—"Templa exornantur," *Churches are decked*.' He then quotes from the Churchwarden's Accouuts of certain Parishes the following '*Items*':—"Of the Church of *St. Mary-at-Hill* in the city of London: "Holme and Ivy at Christmas-Eve, iiijd."—"Of *St. Lawrence's Parish*, Reading, A. D. 1505: "*It.* payed to Makrell for the Holy Bussh agay' Christmas, ijd."—"Of *St. Martin Outwich*, London. A. D. 1524: "It'm for Holy and Ivey at Chrystmas, ijd. Ob. A. D. 1525. Pay'd for Holy and Ivey at

"Chrystmas, ijd.—Of *St. Margaret's*, Westminster. A. D. 1647: "Item, paid for Rosemarie and Bayes that was stuck about the "Church at Christmas. 1s. 6d." A writer in the *Gent's Mag.* for "May. 1811. speaking of the manner in which they celebrate Christmas in the north and ridings of Yorkshire, says:—"The Windows "and Pews of the Church (and also the Windows of Houses) are "adorned with branches of *Holly*, which remain till *Good-Friday*." After quoting a Carol in praise of the *Holly*, written during the reign of Henry VI., BRAND observes:—"From this it should seem "that *Holly* was used only to deck the inside of Houses at Christmas; while *Ivy* was used not only as a Vintuer's sign, but also "among the Evergreens at *Funerals*." COLRS, in his Introduction "to the Knowledge of Plants (Art of Simpling. 12mo. A. D. 1656. "p. 64.) tells us:—"In some places setting up of *Holly*, *Ivy*, *Rosemary*, *Bayes*, *Yew*, &c. in Churches at Christmas, is still in use." STUKELEY, in his 'Medallie History of Carausius' (b. II. p. 163-4) "mentions the introduction of *Mistletoe* into York Cathedral on "Christmas-Eve as a remain of Druidism." Speaking of the Winter "solstice, our Christmas, he says:—"This was the most respectable "festival of our *Druids* called '*Yule-tide*'; when *mistletoe*, which "they called *all-heal*, was carried in their hands and laid on their "Altars, as an emblem of the salutiferous advent of Messiah.... "This custom is still preserved in the North, and was lately at "York."—*Popular Antiq.* ed. by Sir Hen. Ellis. Vol. i. pp. 284—288.

JOHN GAY, the poet, (ob. 1732), and author of the well known "*Fables*," writes:—

'When *Rosemary* and *Bayes*, the poets' crown,  
'Are bawl'd in frequent cries through all the town;  
'Then judge the Festival of CHRISTMASS near,  
'CHRISTMASS the joyous period of the year!  
'Now with bright *Holly* all the Temples strow,  
'With *Laurel* green, and sacred *Mistletoe*.'—

(*Trivia*. b. II. l. 437.).

'I am of opinion,' says BRAND, 'although GAY mentions the "*Mistletoe* among those Evergreens which were put up in Churches, "it never entered those sacred edifices but by mistake, or ignorance "of the Sextons; for it was the heathenish or profane plant, as "having been of such distinction in the pagan rites of Druidism. "....I have made many diligent inquiries after this. I learnt, at "Bath, that it never came into the Church there. An old Sexton "at Teddington in Middlesex informed me, that some *Mistletoe* was "once put up in Church there, but was by the Clergyman immediately ordered to be taken away.'—*Pop. Antiq.* ed. Ellis. I. 285.

WM. HONE thus describes a visit to WORDSWORTH's village of *Grassmere* on June 21st. 'After entering the Church-Yard,' he proceeds:—"The Church-door was open, and I discovered that the "Villagers were strewing the floor with fresh *rushes*. I learnt "from the old Clerk, that, according to annual custom, the *rush-bearing* procession would be in the evening....I observed the "children busily employed in preparing *garlands* of such wild "flowers, as the beautiful valley produces, for the evening procession, which commenced at nine, in the following order:—"The "children (chiefly girls) holding these *garlands*, paraded through

'the village, &c.; they then entered the Church, where the *three largest garlands were placed on the Altar*, and the remaining ones, 'in various other parts of the place.... WORDSWORTH is the chief 'supporter of these rustic ceremonies.'—*Table Book*. Vol. II. col. 277.

We have but few modern opinions to annex.

The ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (*Dr. Musgrave*), when *Bishop of Hereford*, commenting upon *Decorations* generally, remarked—'I cannot omit to warn you against the introduction of any *Decorations* unauthorized by the RUBRIC, and recent custom. Novelties in this kind, though in themselves possibly innocent, may wound the conscience of a weak brother on the one hand, and on the other, may generate and foster unscriptural and dangerous inductions. It is possible to imagine some, which mistaken piety might consider as "efficacious emblems," and in process of time, by an easy gradation, might regard with the same veneration as those "effectual signs of grace," the Sacraments themselves.' (p. 39.)—*Charge*. 1842.

The REV. W. HEWETT says:—'*Yews and Evergreens* should 'be planted in the enclosure (of the Churchyard); they furnish 'those beautiful symbols of eternity with which we decorate our 'Churches at Easter, and Christmas.' (p. 15).—*Arrang. of Par. Churches*.

The Rev. J. KEBLE writes:—'In some Churches it is the 'custom to put up *evergreen boughs* at EASTER, as well as Christmas time.' (p. 275).—*Christian Year*. 12mo.

The Rev. J. C. ROBERTSON remarks in a *Note*—'FERRAR'S 'Church was decorated with *Flowers* (WORDSWORTH'S E. B. IV. '249.); and the use of *Evergreens* at Christmas-tide is universal.' (p. 75).—*How shall we conform to the Liturgy*.

At ST PAUL'S, *Shadwell*, near Leeds (the Rev. C. F. MILNER, Incumbent), the Church at Christmas, 1853, 'was decorated (as is 'more commonly the custom here than in the South) with wreaths 'of *holly, laurel, and box*. The Altar was vested in a new white '*Antependium*; behind it was a dossel of white, with a *pink cross*; 'above which was a wreath of *Evergreens*, with a cluster of *white camellias*. Around the Tapestry in the Apse ran an inscription 'in Lombardic characters—"Christ is horn in Bethlehem."—and 'two coronæ of three lights each were suspended from the arch of 'the Apse. The standard for lights in the Nave, and the pillars, 'were wreathed with *Evergreens*. The December sun lit up 'the beautiful stained windows with great brilliance, and altogether 'the little Church presented a most satisfactory appearance.'—*The Guardian*, January 4. 1854. p. 7.

MR. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) observes:—'A simple and 'harmless custom of adorning Churches with *Flowers*, or *branches of trees*, is probably of great antiquity (PAULINUS, *Natal. 3. 'Felicis*; HIERON. Ep. 3; *Epitaph Nepotian*. ed. Bened. tom. IV. '272.); and it is still the practice in London, and elsewhere in 'England, to decorate the Churches at CHRISTMAS with *Evergreens*.



'In Ireland also, Churches are ornamented not only at CHRISTMAS with *holly* and *ivy*, but on PALM-SUNDAY with branches of *fir-trees*.'—*B. of Com. Pr. E. H. S. p. 350.*

In a *Tract* a 'FEW WORDS TO PARISH-CLERKS, AND SEXTONS,' we read:—'At CHRISTMAS you will take care that the Church is adorned handsomely with *holly*, *laurel*, and *yew*. (*Mistletoe* is not a proper plant). Do not put very little twigs in every hole and corner: but let there be here and there, and especially round the Altar, a large handsome bunch. In some Churches they take them down at *Twelfth-Night*; in others, they let them stay till *Septuagesima-Sunday*; beyond which they should never be kept. In some parts of the country they also put up *Flowers* at EASTER, and WHITSUNTIDE, and a very good custom it is. There is generally a *yew-tree* in the Church-yard, which was planted for the very purpose of having boughs and branches cut from it for the Church: and therefore it is a very foolish thing, when, as I have sometimes known, the Parish does not like any of its branches to be taken.' (p. 9.)—*Pub. by the ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.*

FLOWERS ON THE ALTAR are decorations of a very different character from those already described; and have latterly been introduced into a few of our Churches under peculiar circumstances, and with motives conscientious, perhaps, in themselves, but involving a degree of mystic spiritualism, or intimating some extreme doctrinal developement. The usage is supported by no Ecclesiastical authority, nor can the plea of custom be alleged as an argument in defence of its adoption: we consequently find that the practice has incurred popular censure, which has been followed up by Episcopal inhibition.

The BISHOP OF LONDON (*Dr. Blomfield*), says:—'I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the Clergy, of *decorating the Communion-Table with flowers*; and especially when that decoration is varied from day to day, so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the Saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Church of Rome to deified sinners. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies, and expressive forms, which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to His holy name.' (p. 49.)—*Charge. 1842.*

The BISHOP OF EXETER (*Dr. Phillpotts*) in his argument in the case of *W. G. Parks Smith*, (Clerk) 28th May 1847, who was charged with ornamenting the Communion-Table prepared for the administration of the Lord's Supper on Easter-Day last, with *two glass vases containing flowers*, and a *Cross decked with flowers*, and

which has been partly quoted in preceding pages, thus refers to the particular subject under discussion:—‘Somewhat, I understand was said before the Commissioners (in the previous Commission of Inquiry) respecting the custom in the very earliest and purest ages of decorating Churches with *Flowers*. That such was the custom of primitive times, admits not of doubt; but it can hardly be necessary to say, that this, of itself, is no justification of the adoption of such a practice now. If it were, the performance of Divine Service instead of aiming at anything like uniformity, would vary with the varying measures of antiquarian learning, which might chance to distinguish the different authorities in the several Parishes amongst us.’ (See the remainder of the judgment *supra* pp. 480. 615.)—quoted in STEPHEN’S *Laws Rel. to the Clergy*, p. 1085; the *Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 1110; also in C. G. PRIDEAUX’S *Chw. Guide*, p. 45. n.

The REV. W. GOODE merely cites an Injunction of PARKHURST, *Bp. of Norwich*, (1561.) on the general subject; thus:—‘Item, that they neither suffer the Lord’s-Table to be *hanged* and *decked* like an Altar, neither’ &c. (p. 27, 84.).—*Cer. of Church of England*.

DR. HOOK says:—‘Strewing with *Flowers* is a very simple and most innocent method of ornamenting the Christian Altar, which is enjoined indeed by no law, but which is sanctioned by the custom of some Churches in this kingdom, in which also the Protestant Churches in Germany agree.’ (The author concludes with the remark of *St Jerom* respecting his friend *Nepotian*, already quoted under BINGHAM; *supra* p. 619.)—*Church Dict.* Art. ‘FLOWERS.’

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON—after quoting from the *Ecol. Gazette* for August 1842, the observation which BP. ALEXANDER when visiting Bethlehem made “to the *Greek Bishop*, that the “Armenians and the Greeks do not differ much in their religious opinions; upon which the Greek Bishop replied, ‘Oh yes, look at their ALTAR; you see all those *Vases of Flowers* on it, which they consider a decoration; we have nothing of the kind on our Altars.”—adds, ‘The Bishop who made this speech appears to be followed by the *Rev. F. C. Ewald*, who reports it, and by the *London Society for the Conversion of the Jews*, which has sent it forth to the Public, in considering that some momentous difference of belief is involved in the difference of usage as to *Flowers*.’ (To this is appended a *Note*, as follows:—) ‘It appears that some Clergymen are in the habit of adorning their Altars with *symbolical Flowers*; on which subject there were some observations in the ‘*British Critic*’ a few years ago when the opinions of that periodical were more moderate than at a later time.—*April* 1840.’ (p. 272.)—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.* p. 75.

The QUARTERLY REVIEW censures these decorations with *Flowers* in its strictures already quoted in p. 407.

FLOWERS on Graves.—Strewing the Grave with FLOWERS is a very innocent and ancient custom, but now almost fallen into oblivion: yet when an affec-

tionate heart may prompt such an expression of its feelings in these utilitarian days, it is not necessary surely to question the proceeding, or interrupt it.

BINGHAM speaks of the custom being 'reckoned innocent, and therefore was retained by some Christians without any rebuke. 'St AMBROSE, and St JEROM, both mention it without any censure: 'only they seem to speak of it as chiefly the practice of the vulgar.... St JEROM commends his friend PAMMACHIUS for this, that whilst other husbands scattered *violets*, and *roses*, and *lilies*, and *purple flowers*, upon the graves of their deceased wives, and with such little offices assuaged the grief of their breasts; Pammachius watered the holy ashes and bones of his wife with the balsam of alms-deeds, and charity to the poor. HIERON. Ep. 26. *ad Pamm. de ob. uxor.*).'—*Antiq. of Christian Ch.* xxiii. 111. §. 20.

The HIERURGIA ANGLICANA cites a few instances of *flowers* being strewn upon the *Grave* thus:—'DR. DONNE's grave in 'Old St Paul's (1631). To which place of his burial some 'mournful friends repaired; and as Alexander the Great did 'to the grave of the famous Achilles, so they strewed his 'with an abundance of *curious and costly flowers*; which course 'they (who were never yet known) continued morning and evening 'for many days, not ceasing till the stones were again levelled.' (WALTON's *Lives*, p. 53—54.)—In 1790. It is the custom at 'this day, all over *Wales*, to strew the graves both *within* and 'without the Church with *green herbs*, *branches of box*, *flowers*, *rushes*, and *flags*, for one year; after which such as can afford it 'lay down a stone.' (GOUGH's *Sepul. Mon.* p. CCIV. *Book of Fragm.* p. 82.)—In 1795. It is still a custom in many country 'Churches to hang a *garland of Flowers* over the seats of deceased Virgins—a token, says Bourne, of esteem and love, and as 'an emblem of their reward in the Heavenly Church.' (BRAND'S *Pop. Antiq.* vol. ii. p. 203.)—*Pages* 181, 186.

At MARRIAGES,—the strewing of *Flowers* in the pathway of the Bride along the Church and Churchyard, is not a general usage, nor sanctioned, by any Ecclesiastical law; but when it is a '*fait accompli*,' it may be suffered to pass without comment. *Bouquets*, and *garlands*, however, upon the Communion-Table on these occasions must not be permitted.

### *The Font.*

THIS 'Ornament of the Church' is rendered indispensable by the injunctions of the 81st CANON (of 1603-4), and the requirements of the RUBRICS; and

must therefore be provided, and kept in repair, by the Churchwardens, at the cost of the Parishioners. The CANON directs that the *Font* shall be of *stone*, and that none other shall be used: it also appoints that the *Font* shall stand in its ancient and usual place.

The CANON reads as follows:—

‘According to a *former Constitution*, too much neglected in many places, we appoint that there shall be a FONT of stone in every Church and Chapel where BAPTISM is to be administered; the same to be set in the ancient usual places; in which only FONT the Minister shall baptize publicly.—CANON 81.

\*.\* This ‘*former Constitution*,’ says GIBSON (*Cod.* 360), is one of the CANONS of 1571; and here the duties of the Churchwardens (*Æditiui*) with respect to the *Font* are clearly laid down; and at the same time *Basins* are especially proscribed: thus—

‘Curabunt ut in singulis Ecclesiis sit sacer *Fons*, non *pelvis*, in quo Bap̄ismus ministretur, isque ut decenter et munde conseruetur.’—SPARROW’S *Coll.* p. 235.

The RUBRICS in the *Baptismal Services* of the Liturgy merely speak of the *Font* incidentally, assuming it to be duly provided, and to stand in its proper place.

The *third* RUBRIC at the beginning of the Office for the PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS, directs:—

(a) ¶ ‘When there are Children to be baptized, &c.....  
‘And then the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the people with  
‘the Children, must be ready at the FONT (1552—1662 —  
‘at the Church Door’\* 1549),... And the Priest coming to the  
‘FONT, (which is then to be filled with pure water), and  
‘standing there, shall say,’ (1662).

\*.\* The concluding clause of the above RUBRIC (a) was added at the last Review (1662), and it particularly enjoins that the FONT be ‘filled with pure water:’ this direction is not attended to as it

\* At the end of the Office in the *First* Liturgy of Edward VI. (1549) there is the annexed Rubric:—

‘Note, that if the number of Children to be Baptized, and  
‘multitude of people present be so great that they cannot conveniently stand at the Church-Door: then let them stand  
‘within the Church in some convenient place, nigh unto  
‘the Church-Door: and there all things be said and done, appointed to be said and done at the Church-Door.’—KEELING. 255.

should be; consequently, if a Clergyman at Infant Baptism is called upon to ‘*dip* the child,’ delay and confusion must necessarily arise in procuring a sufficiency of water.

The *last* RUBRIC in the Office for PRIVATE BAPTISM, standing before the *Conditional Form* of administration, also assumes that there is a FONT in the Church: it concludes thus:—

(b) ¶ ‘...*At the dipping of the Child in the FONT he shall use this form of words.*’ (1549—1662)—KEELING. 266, 267.

At the beginning of the Office for ‘BAPTISM TO SUCH AS ARE OF RIPER YEARS,’ the *second* Rubric directs:—

(c) ¶. ‘*And if they shall be found fit, then the Godfathers and Godmothers....shall be ready to present them at the ‘FONT’ &c.* (1662.)

Again, in the same Office before the words of administration, the RUBRIC reads:—

(d) ¶. ‘*Then shall the Priest take each person to be baptized by the right hand, and placing him conveniently by the ‘FONT, according to his discretion, shall ask’ &c.* (1662.)

From the above RUBRICS the following inferences may naturally be drawn—1st, that as the *Font* in accordance with the CANON is of *stone*, and of such a size as to admit, if need be, of a child being dipped therein, it cannot but be a fixture, rendered immovable by its own weight; and 2ndly, that the Minister and people, on all occasions of *Public Baptism*, are bound to repair to the *Font*. Moreover, as the CANON directs that the FONT must be of *stone*, to use a vessel of *pewter*, *earthenware*, or other material than that prescribed, such as an ordinary *Basin*, or a portable *miniature Font*, would be a deviation from Ecclesiastical order, and barely excusable. The FONT is also to stand in its ‘*ancient and usual place* ;’ which, as we gather from the authorities below, is at the *west-end* of the nave near the *south* door, or principal entrance: but as this position is not defined in any CANON or RUBRIC, we shall have to refer to historical evidences for guidance, where we shall also derive further information with respect to the general

construction of the Baptismal *Font*; and perceive likewise that a *Cover* has been usually provided. This, indeed, care and cleanliness will naturally prescribe. The *Cover* is commonly furnished with a *padlock*.

The first authority on the subject is a Constitution of EDMUND, *Abp. of Canterbury* (1233—1242.) in the reign of Henry III. which enjoined:—‘There shall be a *Font* of stone or other competent material in every Church, which shall be decently covered and reverently kept, and not converted to other uses, and the water wherein the child shall be baptized shall not be kept above seven days in the *Font*.’ (Lynd. 241.)—quoted in DR HOOK’S *Church Dict.* p. 272; BURN’S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 109; STEPHEN’S *L. Rel.* to *Cl.* 95.

In 1561. In the Orders taken the 10th day of October in the third year of the reign &c. of *Elizabeth*, it was enjoined:—‘*Item*. That the *Font* be not removed from the accustomed place; and that in Parish Churches the Curates take not upon them to confer Baptism in *Basons*, but in the *Font* customably used.’—*Brit. Mag.* October 1848, p. 419; HEYLYN’S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. ii. 361.

In 1564, there is an Injunction &c. in the ‘*Book of Advertisements*,’ the great source of our present CANONS, to the same effect:—‘*Item*. That the *Fonte* be not removed, nor that the Curate do baptize in *Parishe Churches* in any *Basons*.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 292.

In 1569. ABP. PARKER inquires in his Visitation Articles:—‘*Item*. Whether youre Curates or Ministers or any of them do use to minister the Sacramente of Baptisme in *Basons*, or els in the *Fonte* standing in the place accustomed. And whether the same *Fonte* be decently kepte.’—(*ib.* 321.)

In 1601. BP. BANCROFT inquires in his Visitation Articles:—‘Whether your *Fonts* or Baptisteries be removed from the place

\* ‘*Baptisterium* habeatur in qualibet Ecclesiâ *Baptismali lapideum*, vel aliud competens quod decenter cooperiatur, et reverenter observetur, et in alios usus non convertatur &c.’ (LYND. *Const. Prov. Ang.* 241.)

† In the First LITURGY of Edward VI. (1549.), in the ‘Conditional Form’ of Baptism, the Prayer for sanctifying the Water, following the office for PRIVATE BAPTISM, has a RUBRIC preceding it, which enjoins:—‘The Water in the *Font* shall be changed twice in the month at least. And’ &c. In the SCOTCH LITURGY (1637) this injunction takes the form of a marginal Rubric annexed to the first Prayer in the Office. (KEELING, 236, 268.)

BP. RIDLEY in his Visitation Articles (1550) inquires:—‘Whether the Water in the *Font* be changed every month once?’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 80.

‘where they were wont to stand: or whether any persons, leaving the use of them, do Christen or Baptize in *Basons*, or other vessels not accustomably used in the Church beforetime, or do use any kind of laver with a removeable *Bason*, or have taken down the old and usual *Font* heretofore used in your Parish?’—HIER. ANGLIC. p. 78.

In 1636. BP. WREN, in his orders given in the Diocese of Norwich, requires—‘That the *Font* at Baptism be filled with clean water, and no *Dishes*, *Pails*, nor *Basons* be used in it, or instead of it.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* ii. 204.

In 1637. ABP. LAUD inquires in his Visitation Articles:—‘Whether doth your Minister baptize any Children in any *Bason* or other vessel than in the Ordinary *Font*, being placed in the Church, or doth he put a *Bason* in it.’—HIER. ANGLIC. p. 79.

In 1638. BP. MONTAGUE in his Visitation Articles makes inquiry:—‘Is there in your Church a *Font* for the Sacrament of Baptism, fixed unto the Lord’s freehold and not moveable? Of what materials is it made? where is it placed? whether near unto a Church door, to signify our entrance into God’s Church by Baptism? is it covered, well and cleanly kept? at time of Baptism is it filled with water clean and clear? or is some *Bason*, *Bowl*, or *Bucket*, filled with water, set therein?’—*Camb. Ed.* p. 49.

In 1661. Among the exceptions to the “Book of Common Prayer” at the *Savoy Conference* was one calling for the *Font* to ‘be so placed as all the Congregation may best see and hear the whole administration.’ (CARDWELL’S *Conf.* 324.). To this the Bishops replied—‘The *Font* usually stands, as it did in primitive times, at or near the Church door, to signify that Baptism was the entrance into the Church mystical; “we are all baptized into one body,” (1 Cor. xii. 13)..and the people may hear well enough.’ (*ib.* p. 355.). The Bishops however conceded:—‘That if the *Font* be so placed as the Congregation cannot hear, it may be referred to the Ordinary to place it more conveniently.’ (*ib.* p. 363.).

The above evidences, are sufficiently declaratory of the usage of the times to which they refer, and ought to be capable of reducing the discrepancies of modern days into something like uniformity of practice. We will, however, annex a few Ecclesiastical opinions possessing an explanatory character.

BISHOP OVERALL’S *Chaplain* (cir. 1614—1619), after alluding to the primitive practice of Baptizing in Rivers and Fountains, thus proceeds:—‘The days we now live in have no other remainder of this manner of Baptizing, than the very name; for hence it is that we call our very vessels, which contain water for Baptism FONTS or FOUNTAINS. But this ancient custom (the Church growing to some settled estate) was soon given over, and *Fonts* were erected in *private houses*; yet because the violent persecutions in those elder times barred the Christians from that convenience, their next recourse was to woods and desous places,

'and there they fitted themselves with such *Baptisterials* as they 'could best provide. In more penceable times they drew nearer, 'and made bold to build their *Fonts* at a little distance from the 'Church: afterwards they obtained that they might be set in the 'Church-Porch, and at last got them into the Church. At the 'first in *City-Churches only*, where the Bishop resided, (we now call them *Cathedrals*) unless in case of necessity, and it was 'therefore called the *Mother-Church*: because that as people in 'their mother's womb were born men, so in the *Fonts* of Baptism, 'as in the Church a womb, they were born Christians. In after- 'ages, when it was found that the Mother-Church was too far 'distant from some villages, consideration was had of this incon- 'venience, and from thence the Bishop took occasion to transfer 'the right of Baptism and Burials to other rural Churches, and 'this together with the right of Tithes, made it a Parochial 'Church, such as now we have (See LINW. Prov. *Baptisterium*, in 'verb. *Baptismalis Ecclesia*.)'—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL'S B. of Com. Pr.* p. 55.

BP. SPARROW (*ob.* 1685) writes:—'This Baptizing is to be at 'the *Font*. What the *Font* is, every body knows, but not why it is 'so called.'... (here follows the passage above given ascribed in NICHOLL'S C. Pr. to BP. OVERALL'S Chaplain)—*Rationale* p. 192.

BP. STILLINGFLEET (*ob.* 1699) writes:—'At first, Baptism was 'administered publicly, as occasion served, by rivers; afterwards, 'a *Baptistery* was directed to be built, having a *Basin* in it large 'enough to hold the person to be baptized, the water in which was 'to be continued for seven days only. Afterwards, when immersion 'came to be disused, *Fonts* were set up at the entrance of the 'Churches.'—*Eccl. Cascs*, i. 146. . . (quoted by Dr. Burn, Cripps, and Rogers).

JOHNSON enumerates among the necessary Ornaments of a Parish-Church:—'A *Font of stone* with a cover, the *Font* must be 'large enough to dip a Child in: *Quere*. Whether there ought not 'to be in Parochial Churches, *Fonts* large enough for dipping 'grown persons, since 'tis evident, that any such may require the 'Minister to dip him, if he have not been baptized in his infancy.'—*Clergyman's Vade-Mecum*, i. 18. *Ed.* 1707.

DR. NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712) also refers to the ancient usage of Baptizing in Ponds and Rivers, and to the building of *Baptisteries* in the next age, contiguous to the Churches: 'afterwards,' he adds, 'as this part of the world became generally Christian, the 'Baptism of adults became less frequent; and therefore the 'building *Baptisteries* as distinct rooms from the Church, with 'large *cisterns* to receive the bodies of full grown persons began to 'be left off, and smaller *Fonts* of the present fashion grew into use. 'GREGORIUS *Turanensis* relates of *Clodoveus*, King of the Franks, 'in the 6th century, that he put out an edict, that *Fonts* should be 'erected with the Church, upon the left hand of the going into it. '(*De Mir. S. Mart.* l. ii.). And the council of *Ilerdo*, which was 'held A. D. 524. (as 'tis quoted by *Ivo*) decreed, "*Omnis Presbyter*" ' &c. . . . "Every Priest who cannot procure a *Font of stone*, let 'him have a convenient vessel, which he may use only for the 'office of Baptizing, and which may not be carried out of the



"Church." They chose to have the *Font* made of a *hard solid stone*, and not of a brittle and spongy one; partly, that it might not be so liable to break; and partly, that it might not suck up the consecrated water.'—*Com. Prayer* in loco.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723) speaks of the *Baptisteries* of the early Church being distinct buildings included in the *exedrae*, or structures outside the Church walls; he then adds:—'In the time of JUSTIN MARTYR and TERTULLIAN we are not certain that the Church had any of these *Baptisteries*; but this is past all doubt, however, from their authority that the place of Baptism was not in the Church, but somewhere distinct from it....the first ages all agreed in this, that whether they had *Baptisteries* or not, the place of Baptism was always without the Church. And after this manner *Baptisteries* continued to the sixth age, as appears from what DURANTUS observes out of GREGORY of *Tours*, that he speaks of *Baptisteries* still without the walls of the Church. Though some now began to be taken into the Church-Porch, as that wherein he says, REMIGIUS baptized King CLODOVEUS, and thence they were afterward removed into the Church itself.'.... BINGHAM subsequently explains 'the difference there was anciently between a *Baptistery* and a *Font*, though the names he sometimes confounded together. For the *Baptistery*, properly speaking, was the whole house of building, in which the *Font* stood, and where all the ceremonies of Baptism were performed; but the *Font* was only the *fountain* or pool of water, wherein persons were immersed or baptized.'—*Antiq. of Christian Church*, VIII. 7. §. 1. 4.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742), quoting the Rubrics at the beginning of the Baptismal Office of our *present* Liturgy, as well as those in that of 1549, (see page 626.) thus comments upon the word *Font*,—'so called, I suppose, because Baptism, at the beginning of Christianity, was performed in *springs* or *fountains*. They were at first built near the Church, then in the *Church-Porch*, and afterwards (as it is now usual amongst us) placed in the Church itself, but still keeping the lower end, to intimate that Baptism is the entrance into the mystical Church. In the primitive times we meet with them very large and capacious, not only that they might comport with the general customs of those times, viz. of persons being immersed or put under water; but also because the stated times of Baptism returning so seldom, great numbers were usually baptized at the same time. In the middle of them was always a partition; the one part for men, the other for women; that so by being baptized asunder, they might avoid giving offence and scandal. But immersion being now too generally discontinued, they have shrunk into little small *Fonts*, scarce bigger than mortars, and only employed to hold less *Basons* with water, though this last be expressly contrary to an ancient advertisement of our Church ('*Book of Advertisements*' of Queen Elizabeth: see page 628.). It is still indeed required that there be a *Font* in every Church made of *stone* (CAN. 81st.) because saith DURAND. (*Rat. Div. Off.* VI. 82. 25.), the water that typified Baptism in the wilderness flowed from a *Rock* (Exod. xvii. 6.), and because Christ, who gave forth the living water, is in Scripture called the *Corner-stone* and the *Rock*.' (p. 330.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

Of more modern writers we have the following :—

THE REV. J. W. HEWETT says:—‘The *Font* has been frequently placed in a distinct building, as it is at Canterbury Cathedral, but its more usual position is in the Nave. The 81st Canon enjoins that it be “*of stone*,” and “set in the ancient usual places,” that is, at the western end of the Church. *It should have a Cover of wood, and a Drain by which the water may escape to the earth.*’ (p. 12).—*Arrangement of Parish Churches.*

DR. HOOK defines the *Font* as—‘The *Vase* or *Basin* at which persons seeking regeneration are baptized’... (and after speaking of the primitive usage in language similar to that of BP. OVERALL’S *Chaplain* already quoted, in page 629, he adds:—) ‘At last they were introduced into the Church itself, being placed *at the West end, near the south entrance*.... A *Font* preserved in the Royal Jewel-house, and formerly used for the Baptism of the infants of the Royal Family, was of *silver*.’ (The Author then cites the Constitution of Edmund (see *supra*), the 81st Canon, and the Rubrics of the Baptismal Offices, introducing also the following remark)—‘In which Rubric it may be observed, that there is no note of a *pewter, crockery, wedgewood*, or other such like *Basin* within the *FONT*, to hold the water, which the carelessness or irreverence of some has permitted of late; but that *the Font* is to be filled with pure water: and also that it is *then* to be filled, and not just at the convenience of the Clerk at any time previous; the like reverence being shewn herein as in the parallel order about the Elements in the other holy Sacrament. “The Priest shall then place upon the Table,” &c.—*Church Dict. Art. FONT.*’

THE REV. G. A. POOLE, after describing various examples of *Fonts*, as well as their Canopies, and Covers, remarks:—‘A *Font* of such a structure as to carry with it any reverence at all, is almost never seen in a modern Church: and even in ancient Churches the fine *old Font* gives place too often to a wretched *Basin*, on a still more wretched pedestal; or perhaps, as if by a studied perverseness, the *old Font* being retained, is made a receptacle for the *Basin* really used to contain the water. The ancient place of the *Font* is so far from being regarded, that we have a person writing on the subject of the arrangement of Churches absolutely making it the praise of a *portable Basin*, that it may be placed, if convenient, upon the Altar! The implied requirement of the Rubric, to baptize by immersion, cannot be attended to, when Baptism is performed in such *Fonts* as are now erected; and as for any religion being attached to a particular *Font*, it would not meet with a single rebuke, if the Churchwardens of half the Parishes in the kingdom were to convert the *Fonts* into quick-lime, and put pint *Basins*, on four-legged stools, in their places.’ (p. 55.)... The Author, when referring to the requirements of the CANON, thus observes: “A *Font of Stone*,”—in place of which *wood, iron, earthenware, composition* of divers kinds is now often found; and even where the ‘*Font of Stone*’ remains, the chances are that a *Wedgewood Basin*, or a *pewter plate*, or a *China bowl and saucer*, are placed in it, that the *Font* itself may not be used. There is a dreadful superstition against

‘stone as the material of the *Font*.—“The same to be set up in the ‘ancient usual places.”—A provision ill-obeyed in the use of *Fonts* (or things so called); made to wheel under the Altar when not wanted, or stowed away in the Vestry, or in a north aisle, or set just under the Reading-Desk, or cast out of the Church altogether and never inquired after.—“In which only *Font* the Minister shall baptize:”—As if in anticipation of fond expedients, surpassing anything against which the Canon was directed at first, to escape from the bondage of baptizing and being baptized where our fathers were before us: a *Basin* in the Vestry, in a *Piscina*, on the Altar-Rails, on the very Altar itself, being often substituted for the *Font*, in its “ancient usual place,” which had a meaning, near the door.’ (p. 58)—*Churches, their Structure, &c.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON refers to Canon 81, and proceeds thus:—The *Rubric* directs that it be “filled with pure water,” our Church holding with the Roman, “*aquam veram et naturalem esse de necessitate Sacramenti.*” (Conc. Trid. Sess. VII. Can. 2. de Bapt; Cf. Martene. I. 48). LAUD, WREN, MONTAGUE, and others, require that no *pots*, *pails*, or *basons* be used in it, or instead of it;” and the use of *basins* is also forbidden by the ‘Advertisements’ of 1565. (Doc. Ann. I. 292; II. 204.)....In a *Note* is added:—FERRAR’S *Font* was of brass, and was set near the Pulpit; “the laver,” according to MR. LENTON, “was of the bigness of a Barber’s bason” (Eccl. Biog. IV. 249). This was agreeable to the taste of the Puritans, who in 1573 desired the removal of *Fonts*, and also the *brazen Eagles*, which were ornaments in the Chancel, and made for lectures [*Lecterns?*]. As for the *Eagles*, they “must be molten, to make *pots*, and *basons*, for new *Fonts*.” (STRYPE’S *Parker*, 451.)—How shall we Conform, &c. p. 238.

DR. BURN in his *Ecclesiastical Law* (Phil. I. 109. 369) merely quotes the remarks of Bp. Stillingfleet, the *Constitution of Edmund*, the 81st Canon, and the *Rubrics* of the Liturgy, all which we have cited above. So also ROGERS’ *Eccl. Law*. pp. 67, 154; STEER’S *Par. Law*. Clive, p. 35; STEPHEN’S *Laws Rel. to the Clergy*, pp. 95, 289. MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) follows Dr. BURN, and after quoting CANON 81, adds:—“But it does not seem that it should necessarily be inferred from this, that the practice of immersion had ceased at the time when *Fonts* were directed to be set up in Churches, as the *older Fonts* are always of sufficient size for ‘the immersion of infants.’ (p. 613; see also *ib.* 417.)—*Laws Rel. to the Church and the Clergy*.

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) interpreting CANON 81, says:—“They (the Churchwardens) are also to see that there be a decent *Font* of stone, with a *Cover*, in every Church and Chapel where Baptism is to be administered; and that the same be at or near the west end of the Church, in the same manner as ‘anciently and usually *Fonts* have stood.’ (p. 44).—*Churchwarden’s Guide*.

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE describes the *Font* as—“The vessel which contains the consecrated water to be used in Baptism. ‘Ancient *Fonts* were always large enough to allow of the immersion of Infants, the hollow basin usually being about a foot, or rather more, in depth, and from one and a half to two feet in diameter.’ (In

a *Note* we read here — '*Fonts* vary greatly in size, but the height 'is usually something more than 3ft., and the diameter about 2½ft.'). There are a few *Fonts* of Norman date made of *lead*, but with 'these exceptions the common material for them is *stone* lined with 'lead, having a *hole* in the bottom of the basin through which the 'water can be allowed to escape. By a Constitution of EDMUND 'Abp. of Canterbury (A. D. 1236). *Fonts* were required to be 'covered and locked; at that period the *Covers* are likely, in general, to have been little more than flat moveable lids, but they were 'afterwards often highly ornamented, and were sometimes carried 'up to a very considerable height in the form of spires, and enriched with a variety of little buttresses, pinnacles, and other 'decorations, as at' &c.—*Vol. I. p. 168. 4th Ed.*

The HIERURGIA ANGLICANA, after quoting a few historical evidences which will also be found above, adds in a *Note* :—'Nothing is 'more strictly enjoined by the Canons and Rubrics of our Church 'than the use of a *stone Font*, filled with water, for the Baptismal 'rite; and nothing is more generally neglected. In many Churches '... the *Font* is disused, and a composition *Basin*, set on a tomb 'by the Altar, employed instead. In others, *Basins* of all kinds of 'crockery-ware are placed in the bowl of the *Font*, or on the 'Cover,' &c. (p. 79)—*Ed. by Members of the Ecclesiological Society.*

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA speaks of *Covers* for the FONT, and *Water-buckets*, and *Baptismal Cruets*, Of COVERS.—'According to ancient Constitutions and the constant practice of the 'Church, every *Font* ought to be provided with a *Cover* and *padlock*. This *Cover* need not be more than a mere framing of board 'to fit the top, but it may receive any extent of additional decoration.' (PLATES 13; 36.)—'Flat *Font Covers*, to be made of oak, 'strengthened by ironwork. They are suitable only for *Fonts* of 'earlier date than about 1360. The wood should be 1½in. or 2in. 'thick. The *Covers* are fastened down by an iron bar, passing 'through a staple, which forms a handle in the middle of the 'Cover; the point of this bar runs through another staple let 'strongly into the margin of the *Font*, and the other end of the 'bar being pierced, drops down upon a staple on the opposite side 'of the *Font*, and fastens with a *Padlock*.' (PLATE 19.)—'The fixed 'iron bar is preferable.' (PLATE 44.)—'*Water-Buckets* are of 'metal.... The chief use of these *Buckets* is for filling the FONT; 'for which purpose an appropriate vessel has often been wanted. '.... The *Baptismal Cruet*, of full size, is intended for 'Private 'Baptisms,' in which cases the Parish Priest is generally in want of 'a proper vessel. This is not meant for use at the *Font*; although 'it is desirable that a vessel of some sort, a *shell* for instance, should 'be employed at the *Font* for Baptism by affusion. Baptism by 'aspersion is a practice open to grave objections.' PLATE 68.

In POPULAR TRACTS it is said, after quoting CANON 81,—'The 'ancient usual place is the west end of the Nave. The FONT should 'have a *Cover*. It is a shame to use a *Basin* of any kind, as is too 'often the case, when there is a FONT. The *Font* should have a 'drain, with a *chained cork* to stop it, so that when the Baptism is 'over, the water may be allowed to run away untouched. This is

'no more than reverence and decency require, and I would suggest to the Priest that he himself do see the water run off before he leaves the *Font*.' (p. 4.)—No. I. 'THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES' (Pub. by *Masters*).

In a *Tract*, entitled "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS," we read:—'Perhaps it might seem to you an improvement to move the *Font* away from its place by the Door, and to put it (as is now often done) just before the Communion-Rails. Now they who do so make two great mistakes. The *Font* was not put near the Door by chance, for it was meant to shew by this that Baptism is the Door by which a child is brought into the Church: (for which reason it is ordered by a Canon, that the *Font* shall stand in the "ancient usual places," that is, somewhere towards the West, and near a Door). They first lose sight of that meaning; and then they make another and a worse mistake, by carrying the *Font* into the Chancel. For the Chancel is that part of the Church which is kept apart for the holiest offices to which the child can be admitted when he comes to the full privileges of a Christian.... The *Font* should be taken care of: it should be of *stone*, large enough to dip Infants in, and should have the *water-drain* with its plug, and the *Cover*, in good order; those small *Basins* which sometimes stand in it are against the orders of the Church. I need not say how painful it is, on lifting up the Cover of the *Font*, to find it used as a Box to hold rubbish, torn books, ends of tallow candles, and the like.' (p. 8)—*Pub. by the ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.*

The QUARTERLY REVIEW speaking of the *Font*, and its place, says:—'The ancient, and in general the present site of the *Font* is at the Church-Door. We are very far from falling in with the fancy of *symbolizing* all the material forms of our Churches and their accessories with spiritual meanings, and we do not think, with the *IRRATIONALE* of DURANDUS, that the *Font* was generally formed of *stone* as a type of the Rock from which water flowed in the wilderness; but we do believe that its situation *near the Door* of the Church, and sometimes even in a *Baptistery* outside, was designed to show that Baptism marked the entrance into the Church, both materially and spiritually.'... (After referring to the practice of the Congregation, prior to the introduction of seats in the nave, turning round towards the west at the time of a Baptism, and participating in the Service, and to the impediments that arose when seats and prayer-desks were set up; the REVIEWER proceeds:—)'Then we suppose grew up the practice of baptizing in the body of the Church, and as the stone *Font* was not moveable, some kind of *Basin* was irreverently used—but this irreverence was not, as has been sometimes represented, wanton—for if the Minister was, according to the Rubric, to perform the service to the edification of the Congregation, he was forced to get some substitute for the *Font*. But this is not the only difficulty. Those Clergymen who now comply with the Rubric as to *time* are forced to disregard the Rubric as to *place*, for they do not '*come to the Font*,' as is expressly ordered. A few have endeavoured to reconcile all by moving the *Font* up to the Reading-desk; that is, by making the *Font* '*come*' to them, as they cannot '*come to the Font*'; but this is in some cases impossible—in others very incon-

'venient, and unsightly—and in all it is a contravention of the old Canon which forbids equally the displacing of the *Font* and the use of the *Basin*, and it is moreover a departure from the ancient symbolical position of the *Font* near the Church-Door, which is older than the Rubrics, and with which the Rubrics were intended to harmonize:—so that, as in all the rest, this overstraining after precision only produces fresh difficulties.' (p. 269).—No. cxliii. May 1843.

\* \* Many illustrated specimens of *Fonts* have been published in certain works, to which we must refer our readers who wish for information of this kind:—G. R. LEWIS'S *Early Fonts of England* pt. I. folio 21s.; F. A. PALEY'S *Illustrations of Baptismal Fonts*. 8vo. 21s.; F. J. SIMPSON'S *Ancient Baptismal Fonts*. Imp. 8vo. 16s.

### [Images, Pictures, Painted Windows.]

We are happily not called upon in these days to discuss the subject of *Images*, and *Pictures*, with the view of questioning the right to introduce them into our Protestant Churches for purposes of worship and adoration; for this is not only prohibited by Statute Law (3 & 4 *Edw. VI. c. 10.*), and by the *Articles*, and *Homilies*, but utterly opposed to the religious feeling of this period. Still our attention is necessarily drawn to the question in consequence of the modern taste for Ecclesiastical decoration displaying itself very prominently in *Paintings*, and in *painted or stained-glass Windows*. The latter, from not being confined to the hues and tints of simple colouring, but embracing the portraiture of persons, and events, described in Scripture history, have been placed by some Clergymen in the same category with *Images* properly so called; and have been in consequence regarded with grave suspicion. It must be confessed, that however pleasing to the eye as a matter of tasteful embellishment, or agreeable to the feelings as aids to devotion, such pictorial illustrations may be considered, yet their *introduction* into Parish Churches is, *strictly speaking*, contrary to the enactments of the *temporal law*. Nevertheless, the admission of this species of ornament into Parish Churches, derived probably from its revival in our *Cathedrals*, appears to have met in many cases with the approbation and concurrence of

the people, and also to have received the tacit sanction of our Ecclesiastical governors.

If, however, the setting up of a *painted window* is not illegal, which indeed has been asserted under the supposition that the Statute has expired, it is evident that some forethought is necessary before a Clergyman could venture to introduce into his Church, or even Chancel, a *window* illuminated with figures in *stained-glass*, whether it be for ornament, or as a memorial of a deceased parishioner; since it may *possibly* be productive of objections in the minds of some of the Congregation, and cause an appeal to the Ordinary. The same may be said of *Tapestries*, and *Hangings*. It must at the same time be remembered, that when once admitted these Paintings cannot be removed without the permission of the Ecclesiastical superior.

The taste for *painted windows* appears in some measure to have superseded that which lately prevailed for the decorated Triptych, the Reredos, and the *Altar-Piece*. But *Images*, as distinct from Pictures or Paintings, are so opposed to the tenets of our Protestant worship, that there is no probability of their being forced upon an unwilling Congregation of a Protestant Church in an age like the present; with the exception, however, of the symbol of the *Cross*, which has already been disposed of. See page 609.

With regard to the figures and effigies on *Tombs*, they are exempted from objection by a specific clause of the Statute referred to, as will be presently seen.

We will now pass to the consideration of the Civil and Ecclesiastical authorities of force at the present day, bearing upon *Pictures*, and *Paintings*, in Parish Churches; as well as of such historical evidences as may throw additional light upon the subject.

The STATUTE LAW, ordering the removal and destruction of *Images*, *Paintings*, &c., inferentially

prohibits their introduction. The Statute is the 3 & 4 *Edw. VI. c. 10.* (A. D. 1549.), ‘An Act for abolishing and putting away of divers Books and *Images* :’ and its enactments are held by Ecclesiastical lawyers to be binding upon us at this day. The substance of the *first Section*, which refers to ‘*divers Books*,’ has been given in p. 272. The *second Section*, which orders the destruction of *Images* in Churches, thus reads :—

‘Be it enacted....if any person or persons....that now have ‘or hereafter shall have in his, her, or their custody....any ‘*Images* of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven, carved, or ‘*painted*, which heretofore have been taken out of any Church ‘or Chapel, or yet stand in any Church or Chapel, and do not ‘before the last day of June next ensuing deface and destroy, or ‘cause to be defaced and destroyed, the same *Images*, and every ‘of them’....shall for the *first* offence forfeit 20s.; for the *second*, £4.; and for the *third*, be imprisoned during the King’s pleasure.—*Sect. 2.*

*Images* on TOMBS are allowed by a subsequent *Section* to remain; thus :—

‘Provided always, that this Act or anything therein contained, shall not extend to any *Image* or *Picture* set or graven ‘upon any Tomb in any Church, Chapel, or Church-Yard, only ‘for a monument of any King, prince, nobleman, or other dead ‘person, which hath not been commonly reputed and taken for a ‘*Saint*, but that such *Pictures* and *Images* may stand and ‘continue in like manner and form as if this Act had never ‘been had nor made; any thing in this Act to the contrary in ‘any wise notwithstanding’—*Sect. 6.* (This Act was repealed by Statute, 1 *Mar., St. II. c. 2*; but revived by Statute, 1. *Jas. I. c. 25. s. 48.*)

\* \* The demolition of *Monuments* was also restrained in the reign of Elizabeth by a Royal Proclamation. A. D. 1560. (CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann. i.* 257).

In addition to this *Statute* we may refer our Readers, especially upon the question of the worship and adoration of *Images* &c., to the 22nd of the XXXIX ARTICLES, and to the HOMILY ‘*Against Peril of Idolatry, and Superfluous Decking of Churches* ;’ particularly to *Parts II & III*, where this subject is treated *in extenso* : the authority of this *Homily* is enforced by the 35th of the XXXIX ARTICLES.

*Pictures* already existing in any *Window* of a Church may not be destroyed without the permission of the Ordinary.



DR. BURN remarks :—‘ All this shall not be done *by any person* on his own authority, but he ought to have the licence of the Ordinary {*Cro. Jac.* 366}. And if any shall do so without the licence of the Ordinary, *Dr. Godolphin* says, he shall bind him to his good behaviour; but the meaning is only, that *he may be bound to his good behaviour*, not by the Ordinary, but by the temporal Judge, as in *Prickett’s case*, (which is the case referred to), the offender was bound to his good behaviour, not by the Ordinary, but by the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King’s Bench.’—*Ecc. Law. Phil.* ii. 337

Again.—‘ If any superstitious *Pictures* are in a *window* of a Church or Aisle, it is not lawful for any to break them without licence of the Ordinary; and in *Prickett’s case*, WRAY C. J. bound the offender to the good behaviour (*Cro. Jac.* 366).’—Burn’s *Ecc. Law Phil.* i. 374; STEER’S *Par. Law.* Clive. p. 37; Hook’s *Church Dict. Art.* “ORNAMENTS.”

From historical evidences we gather the following information :—

A Constitution of ABP. WINCHELSEY (A. D. 1290—1313.) ordained that ‘ *Images* in the Church, and the *principal Image* in the Chancel, (viz. of the *Saint* to whom the Church is dedicated) shall be provided at the charge of the Parish.’—(*Lynd.* 251.)

In 1547, Among the *Injunctions* of Edward VI. it is declared :—‘ That they shall take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines . . . *pictures, paintings*, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition; so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, *glass windows*, or elsewhere within their Churches or houses.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 17. (See also *ib.* p. 7.). This order was confirmed at the close of the same year by a letter from the King in Council to ABP. CRANMER, calling upon him to see—‘ that all the *Images* remaininge in any Church or Chappell within your Diocese be removed and taken away’—(*ib.* i. 40. HEYLYN’S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. i. 115.). CRANMER immediately issued Visitation Articles, making inquiry in the words of the *Injunction* of Edward VI. given above.—(CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 42).

In 1549 appeared the Act of Parliament (3 & 4 *Edw.* VI. c. 10.) already quoted.

In 1550 BP. RIDLEY inquires in his Visitation Articles :—‘ Whether there be any *Images* in your Church, tabernacles, shrines &c.’ (*ib.* i. 80.).

In 1559 Among the *Injunctions* of Elizabeth is one identical with that of *Edward VI.* already cited. (*ib.* i. 189):—and the prohibition is made to extend to private houses. (*ib.* i. 194).—In the Visitation Articles also put forth later in the same year, inquiry is made,—‘ Whether in their Churches and Chapels all *Images, pictures, paintings*, and all other monuments of feigned and false miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, be removed, abolished, and destroyed :’ (*ib.* i. 210):—and in houses. (*ib.* i. 215). The lukewarmness of the Queen however in this matter, led to an

address being presented to her Majesty, advancing reasons against the use of *Images*. (*ib.* i. 235).

In 1569, ABP. PARKER in his Visitation Articles inquires:—‘Whether *ymages* and al other monuments of ydolatry and superstition be destroyed and abolyshed in your several paryshes.’—(*ib.* i. 321).

In 1639, ‘The Parish of *All Hallows, Barking*, complained to the Bp. of London that certain *Pictures* and *Images*, contrary to the Laws of the Church of England, had been set over the FONT of their Church, and that the Communion-Table was not in its usual place. The Bishop’s Chancellor, the celebrated ARTHUR DUCKE, tried the question, and decreed the *Pictures* to be taken down.’ (This case is more fully given in GIBSON’S *Codex* App. ii. 1465.)—BURN’S *Eccl. Law* Phil. i. 374; STEPHEN’S *Laws Rel. to the Clergy* 290; *ih. Com. Pr.* E. H. S. 366.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723) informs us ‘that the Romanists hold *Pictures* and *Images* to be derived from Apostolic practice; and to have been imposed at a Council of the Apostles held at Antioch, but PETAVIUS and PAGI confess this to be a fiction of the modern Greeks: PETAVIUS owns likewise that for three or four of the first ages there was little or no use of *Images* in Churches. There are positive proofs in the fourth age that in some places they were not allowed to be set up in Churches. One of the Canons of the Council of *Eliberis* (Can. 36.—A. D. 305) in Spain runs in these words—‘We decree that *Pictures* ought not to be in Churches, lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted upon the walls.’ So EPIPHANIUS writes to JOHN, bp. of Jerusalem, as translated by JEROM, stating, that “when passing through *Anabatha*, a village of Palestine, he found there a veil hanging before the doors of the Church, wherein was painted the image of Christ, or some Saint; for he did not well remember whether it was; but seeing, however, the image of a man hanging in the Church against the authority of Scripture, he tore it in pieces, and advised the guardians of the Church rather to make a winding sheet of it, to bury some poor man in.” (EPIPH. Ep. *ad Joh. Hieros.*). BELLARMINE, BARONIUS, and some others, consider this passage an interpolation, but PETAVIUS declares it genuine, and says—“*Images* were not allowed in the time of EPIPHANIUS in the Cyprian Churches.” (*De Incarnat.* xv. 14. n. 5. 8.). ‘In fact, the case is clear,’ says BINGHAM, ‘that Christians for near 400 years did not allow of *Images* in Churches. TERTULLIAN indeed once mentions the picture of a Shepherd bringing home his lost sheep, upon a Communion-Cup in some of the Catholic Churches. But as this is a singular instance only of a symbolical representation or emblem, so it is the only instance PETAVIUS pretends to find in all the three first ages. . . . Yet it is not denied, but that in some places, about the latter end of the 4th century, *Pictures of Saints and Martyrs* began to creep into Churches. PAULINUS Bp. of Nola . . . ordered the Church (of St. Felix) to be painted with the *images of Saints*, and Scripture histories, such as those of *Esther*, and *Job*, and *Tobit*, and *Judith*, (Natal. 9. *Felicitis*. p. 615). And some intimations are given of the beginnings of the same practice in other places by ST AUSTIN, who often speaks of the *Pictures of Abraham sacrificing his Son*, and of the *Pictures of Peter*, and of

‘Paul, and of some worshippers of Pictures too, but they have not his approbation, nor had they the approbation of the Catholic Church.’

‘...The first design of bringing *Pictures* into Churches was only for ornament or history, and not for worship and adoration, as ST AUSTIN, and PHILOSTORGIUS have declared. And this may be further confirmed from the fact that at first the pictures of the living had their place in the Church, as well as the dead, and Bishops and Kings were joined with Saints, and Martyrs.’ The *worship of Images* soon followed, ‘yet it was never approved till the *Seccond Council of Nice*, A. D. 787, made a decree in favour of it. SERENUS bp. of Marseilles ordered all Images to be defaced and cast out of all the Churches of his diocese: and though GREGORY the Great blamed him for this, and defended the use of *Pictures* in Churches as innocent, and useful for instruction of the vulgar, yet he equally condemns the worship and adoration of them.’ (See RIDDLE’s *Christian Antiq.* p. 812).... ‘The Decrees of Nice (of 787) were rejected by all the Western world, the Popes of Rome only excepted...and for some hundred years after the *worship of Images* was not received in any of the three nations (Germany, France, and Britain)....PETAVIUS says, the ancients never allowed any pictures of *God the Father*, or the *Trinity*, to be set up in their Churches....because it was supposed He never appeared in any visible shape, but only by a voice from heaven. Upon this account PAULINUS, when he describes a symbolical representation of the *three Divine Persons*, made in the *painting* of a Church, makes a *Lamb* to be the symbol of Christ, and a *Dove* the symbol of the Holy Ghost, but for God the Father nothing but a voice from heaven (from *Deut.* iv. 12).’ PETAVIUS also states “that the ancients did not approve of massy *Images*, or Statues of wood, or metal, or stone, but only *Pictures* or *Paintings* to be used in Churches....(they) were thought to look too much like *idols*.... It is most certain from the writings of ST AUSTIN (in *Psal.* 113), and OPTATUS (*lib.* 2), that there were no *Statues* in that age in their Churches, or upon their Altars, because they reckon both those to be mere heathenish customs.”...CASSANDER says that “till the time of the 6th General Council (*Cone. Trull.* c. 83), the Images of CHRIST were not usually in the effigies or figure of a *Man*, but only symbolically represented under the type of a *Lamb*: and so the HOLY GHOST was represented under the type or symbol of a *Dove*: but that Council forbade the picturing of Christ any more in the symbol of a *Lamb*, and ordered it only to be drawn in the effigies of a *man*.” I presume by this time the *worship of Images* was begun. A. D. 692....*Images* were introduced at first only for historical use, to be laymen’s books, and a sort of ornaments for the Church, though, as the event proved, the most dangerous of any other.”—(Abbreviated from *Antiq. of Christian Church* VIII. 8. §. 6—11: more so in RIDDLE’s *Christian Antiq.* p. 742.)

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) remarks:—‘No *Images* were worshipped, or, so much as used in Churches, for at least 400 years after Christ.’... (the Author then cites the Canon of the *Council of Eliberis*, already quoted, and adds—) ‘The first use of *Statues* and *Pictures* in the Churches was merely historical, or to add some beauty and ornament to the place, which after ages improved into superstition and idolatry:’ (he here speaks of the case of Eri-

PHANIUS mentioned by BINGHAM as above, and thus proceeds)... 'I hope, it is clear enough, that the primitive Christians, as they 'thought it sufficient to pray to God without making their addresses to Saints and Angels, so they accounted their Churches 'fine enough without *Pictures* and *Images* to adorn them.' (p. 86.)—*Rat. Ill. of B. of C. Pr.*

Modern authorities on this subject are but few, the question having excited very little discussion, from the fact of *Images* and *Pictures* not having been attempted to be set up 'for adoration.' The '*Obituary Window*' will be more fully considered under "Monuments and Gravestones," *postea*.

The REV. W. GOODE, after quoting the Statute, 3 & 4 Edw. VI. remarks that—"The Act extends to *pictures* as well as *statues* 'under the name of Images..(and) was more especially directed 'against the Images of those who have been reputed and worshipped as *Saints*. Of course, the *Crucifix* was included in the 'prohibition; and also the *Cross*, as having been the object of 'worship and adoration.'..(he then refers to the *Homily* 'Against Peril of Idolatry,' and quotes the Injunctions of Edward and Elizabeth, as well as the opinions of the Reformers during the reign of Elizabeth as given in the 'Zurich Letters'; but they bear especially on the *Cross* and the *Crucifix*; and he concludes with a reference to the offer of the Royal Academicians in 1773 to decorate St Paul's Cathedral with paintings representing Scripture histories, quoting BP. NEWTON'S remark (*Works*, p. 107.) that *Terrick*, Bp. of London, "strenuously opposed it...whatever were his reasons, "it must be acknowledged, that some other serious persons "disapproved the setting up of *Pictures* in Churches." 'If such "was the feeling with respect to historical *Pictures*, there needs no 'proof what would have been the reception given to an attempt to 'restore any thing that had been in Popish times an object of 'worship.' (p. 49—75.)—*Cer. of Ch. of England*.

The REV. R. HART observes:—"Panel *paintings* at the back of 'the Altar, &c. were sometimes large squares or oblongs, representing some entire legend or Scripture subject. At other times 'the Altar-Screen (*Peredon*) was, like the Rood-screen, in narrow 'compartments, each of which contained a *picture* of some *Saint* 'with his appropriate emblem; his head being surmounted by a '*nimbus* and with a diaper pattern painted in the back-ground. 'The heading of the compartment serves as a Canopy....At 'Durham Cathedral there was a representation of our Lord's 'passion, with S. John on one side and the blessed Virgin on the 'other, "being large *pictures* of a yard of five quarters long, very 'richly wrought in silver, all smoked black over, and on every one 'of their heads a crown of pure beaten gold." The generality of 'these *Images* were however carved in wood or stone. The "imago principalis in cancello" was the image of the patron 'Saint of the Church in its Chancel....*Tapestries* representing 'Scriptural subjects or legends, were often hung upon the Church 'walls. From the Melford Catalogue it appears that Scriptural 'subjects were frequently *stained* upon cloth. *Frescoes* (using the

'term loosely to signify *Paintings* upon sized plaster) may frequently be traced upon the walls of our ancient Churches.... Sometimes diaper patterns are painted upon the walls, and the image of S. Christopher carrying the infant Saviour is often painted upon a large scale over the north-door. Of *stained-glass*.... the early specimens are like mosaic work, being small pieces of one colour, each being separately leaded. Mention is made of this species of ornament about the middle of the 9th century, but that in the aisles to the choir of Canterbury Cathedral, made about the beginning of the 12th century, is probably our oldest English example.... *Wood carvings* of Angels or the like, are frequently observable in the interior of the roof.... The *Mappa Mundi*, often placed over the Altar, was a picture of the Day of Judgment. An *All-hallows* was a picture or a sculptured representation of all the Saints. A *Jesse* was a representation of our Saviour's genealogy, like a tree proceeding from the root of *Jesse* (David's father), each generation being represented in effigy at the ends of the branches.' (p. 241.)—*Ecol. Records*.

DR. HOOK, explaining the *Altar-Piece*, says this is—'A picture placed over the Altar. It is not uncommon in English Churches to place Paintings over the Altar, although it is a practice of modern introduction, and although there would be a prejudice against placing paintings in other parts of the Church. The English Reformers were very strongly opposed to the introduction of *Paintings* into the sanctuary. In Queen Elizabeth's reign a proclamation was issued against *Pictures* as well as *Images* in Churches; and Dean NOWELL fell under her Majesty's displeasure for procuring for her use a Prayer-Book with pictures. The Puritans, who formed the religious world of King Charles's time, both in the Church and out of it, destroyed pictures wherever they could find them, as relics of popery. We may add that the feeling against *Pictures* prevailed not only in modern times, but in the first ages of the primitive Church. In the various catalogues of Church furniture that we possess, we never read of Pictures.'... (After referring to the *Council of Eliberis*, the anecdote of *Epiphanius*, and the remarks of *Paulinus*, which will be found under BINGHAM, *supra*, he proceeds:—) 'The reader will find a learned historical investigation of this subject in note B to the translation of TERTULLIAN'S APOLOGY in the *Library of the Fathers*,' which is thus summed up:—(1) In the first three centuries it is positively stated that Christians had no *Images*.—(2) Private individuals had *Pictures*, but it was discouraged. (AUG.)—(3) The *Cross*, not the *Crucifix*, was used; the first mention of the *Cross* in a Church is in the time of Constantine.—(4) The first mention of *Pictures* in Churches, except to forbid them, is at the end of the 4th century, and these historical Pictures from the Old Testament, or of martyrdoms, not of individuals.—(5) No account of any picture of our Lord being publicly used occurs in the first six centuries; the first is A. D. 600.—(6) Outward reverence to *Pictures* is condemned. We find frequent allusion to *Pictures* in the writings of St. Augustine. We thus see that the use of *Pictures* in Churches is to be traced to the 4th century; and we may presume that the practice of the age, when the Church was beginning to breathe after its severe perse-

'outions, when the great Creed of the Church Universal was drawn up, and when the Canon of Scripture was fixed, is sufficient to sanction the use of *pictures* in our Sanctuaries. That in the middle ages, *Pictures* as well as *Images*, were sometimes worshipped, as they are by many Papists in the present day, is not to be denied. It was therefore natural that the Reformers, seeing the abuse of the thing, should be strongly prejudiced against the retention of *pictures* in our Churches. But much of Romish error consists in the abuse of what was originally good or true. We may, in the present age, return to the use of what was originally good; but being warned that what has led to Popish corruptions may lead to them again, we must be very careful to watch against the recurrence of those evil practices to which these customs have been abused or perverted.'—*Church Dict. Art. "ALTAR PIECE."*

The REV. G. A. POOLE remarks:—'We have sometimes *fresco* paintings covering great portions of the Walls. These paintings have, for the most part, been covered with the successive coats of whitewash, and yellow ochre, with which Churchwardens have literally daubed the interior as well as the exterior of Churches.... There are now, happily, some indications of a revival of the use of colour in the decoration of Churches; and that not only in the windows, but also in the roof, the floor, and the walls. The use of *fresco* is not without its advocates, and it will doubtless be employed again to a great extent. Subjects are numerous, without the smallest suspicion of an improper representation of divine things or persons. Symbolical representations of the Christian's faith and hope, and of the mysteries and privileges of our divine religion, afford many apt decorations, besides the more elaborate representation of historical incidents. The use of emblems.... is probably as old as Christianity itself: and the fancy of pious persons has continued it to the present day.... Among the most apt and venerable may be mentioned the *Trine Compas*.... or a *Circle inscribed within an equilateral triangle*; denoting the co-equality and co-eteruity of the Three Divine Persons in the ever blessed and undivided TRINITY: the *Hand* extended from the clouds in the attitude of benediction; for the FIRST PERSON in the Trinity: the *Lamb* triumphant, the *Fish*, the *Pelican* wounding her own breast to feed her young, and others; for the Son of God, JESUS CHRIST our Lord: the *Dove*, for the HOLY GHOST. The *Chalice* receiving the blood of a wounded Lamb, for the Holy Eucharist: the *Phoenix* rising from the flames, for the *Resurrection*: the *Cross*, for the Christian's life of conflict: the *Crown*, for his hope of glory. All these are beautifully significant, and are very innocent in their use, as well as pious in their intention.... When there are other than emblematical figures employed in composition for the decoration of Churches, there is a *semi-theological* question, as to what figures are admissible. There is a cry against the advocates for *Pictures* in Churches, and in general for more elaborate and costly decorations, that they are *reviving idolatry*; but it is the cry of a party, and, as in most cases of the like kind, with no justice, and very little wisdom. The real danger now is not of *idolatry*, but of *irreverence*. Though a cry would be instantly raised if some were to talk of adorning their Chancels with *figures of the Saints*, yet *Altar-Pieces* are every where com-

'mon; and even the most puritanical times and places admitted Moses and Aaron holding the Commandments, David playing on his harp, the heathen devices of Time with his scythe and forelock, and Death—the skeleton Death—with his arrow and his hour-glass. To these are added, Cherubs, and St. Cecilias 'ad libitum,' and no one is heard to complain. The chief horror seems to be against representations that claim to be Christian.... Why these should not be admitted, either in painting or sculpture, it were hard to discover, except by a factious process of party reasoning. We may presume then that the application of art to the decoration of Churches will revive in this, as in other matters.' (pp. 76—80).—(The author concludes with a quotation from the allegorizing DURANDUS, and touches upon the construction of *painted Windows*, but not upon the point we are now discussing.)—*Churches, their Structure, &c.*

The REV. J. E. RIDDLE gives a brief historical sketch of the introduction of *Pictures* and *Images* into our Churches: (p. 742.) (similar to what we have already given from BINGHAM, see *supra*) as well as the decisions of GREGORY the Great on this subject. (p. 812.) With respect to *stained glass Windows*, he observes:—'The origin of *glass Windows* is usually referred to the 3rd century; but many antiquaries conclude, from some of the remains of 'Herculaneum, that it may be traced to an earlier date.... It is certain that *glazed Windows* were common in France during the 6th century; some of which were variegated. The art of *painting on glass*, which, according to PLINY, was not unknown to the Romans, reappeared at the beginning of the 11th century; and, in the course of the 15th and 16th centuries, it attained to a height of perfection from which it has since that period declined.' (p. 737).—*Christian Antiq.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON says:—' *Images* used to be defended on the ground that they were "*laymen's books*;" but this symbolism is very hard reading even for Clerks in general; and we may be sure that if an attempt were made to introduce it among the common people, there must follow a misunderstanding, a confusion of type and thing typified, which could not but lead to wretched superstitions. (p. 320)'—*How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX states:—'The *Churchwardens* being appointed for the repair of the Church, can have no power or authority to deface or demolish any thing in it; but if there should be any superstitious *Pictures*, or *Paintings in the Windows*, or on the Walls, or elsewhere, which may give just cause of offence, or any thing else which may either be a hindrance to the due performing of any of the Divine Offices, or be inconvenient to the Parishioners in their attendance on them, the licence of the Ordinary must be first had before they can be legally removed.' (p. 267).—*Churchwarden's Guide.*

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE writes:—'It was not unusual to decorate the wall at the back of an Altar with panelings, &c., in wood, or with embroidered hangings of *tapestry-work* to which the name of '*Reredos*' was given.' (p. 305).—Under the word "GLAZING" we read:—'During the middle ages

'the use of coloured glass in Windows was almost universal...it appears certainly to have been employed as early as the 9th century, but no examples remain of nearly so high antiquity. The earliest style of coloured glazing of which we have any information, appears to have consisted of rude representations of the human figure....The oldest specimens that can be referred to in this country are in the aisles of the Choir of Canterbury Cathedral; these appear to be of the 12th century &c., the general design consists of panels of various forms, containing subjects from *Holy Writ*....Of the 13th century much most magnificent glazing exists; examples may be found in the Cathedrals and Churches of this country, though generally in a mutilated condition....the general design of the best glazing of this period very frequently consists of panels, which are often either circles or quatrefoils, containing subjects from *Scripture history*, or the lives of *Saints*, the intermediate parts &c...At the commencement of the *Decorated style* the glazing continues to be often arranged in panels, but, &c. single figures are more extensively used than in the preceding style....the openings of the tracery are sometimes occupied by small figures, or shields charged with *armorial bearings*, but most usually with *foliage* of character to correspond with the rest of the glazing; *heraldry* is oftener introduced than in the Early English style....On the extinction of the *Decorated style*, the general character of the glazing becomes more uniform, consisting for the most part of large figures with elaborate canopies over them, &c.; as the style advances greater freedom of design is introduced, and the whole Window is sometimes occupied with one general subject, the figures of which are arranged with considerable effect, and are treated in a more artistical manner than at any earlier period; *heraldry* is now abundantly introduced, and *inscriptions* on long narrow scrolls are sometimes very freely used...From the time of the Reformation very little attention has been paid to the subject of coloured glazing in this country, it is therefore not surprizing that its character should have declined from that period in England faster, and to a greater extent, than on the continent...figures continue to be very generally used in large or rich buildings sometimes placed singly in the different lights, but oftener combined in subjects embracing the whole or a large portion of the Window\* &c.'—(p. 183).—4th Edit.

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA speaking of the adornment of the back of the Altar, thus describes the example it gives of a *Triptych* :—The *Triptych* stands on the super-altar of an Altar. The two leaves are diaped; they fold in and cover the middle part. The picture is taken from one by *Taddeo Gaddi*. Several papers in "The Ecclesiologist" have been devoted to the question

---

\* If the Reader wishes to pursue this study further he is referred to 'An Inquiry into the Difference of Style in Ancient Glass Paintings,' 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 10s. J. H. Parker. BALLANTINE'S *Treatise on Painted Glass*, roy. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Chapman and Hall. WINSTON'S *Introd. to Study of Painted Glass*, 8vo. 2s. 6d. J. H. Parker; and to COUNT F. de LASTEYRIE'S celebrated Work.



‘of the best adornment of the back of Altars. The reader is referred especially to one in Vol. III. p. 33. which proves that there is no authority for placing the ‘*Table of Commandments*’ at the ‘east end of the Chancel.’—*Plate 67.*

The *Tract*, a “FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS,” observes :—  
 ‘I need not advise you to take care of what *stained glass* has been left. You should pick all the pieces out and fill some one window with them, placing them in a pattern. Leave a border of plain ground glass round the edge, if you have not enough to fill the whole light. Above all things avoid having Windows, as we now sometimes see them, of plain glass with a streak of red, or yellow, or green, all round. Nothing can be more frightful than such a glare. In old glass sometimes the pattern is spoilt, because some of the pieces have been unskilfully put in wrong side outwards or upside down : this it would be very easy to set right. Sometimes fancy coats of arms are made up without any regard to the laws of Heraldry : but Heraldry is an old science, and one full of meaning to those who know it, so that to them a sham shield is worse than foolish . . . If any one wishes to give a modern *stained-glass Window* to a Church, you should withhold your consent till some fit person has looked carefully at the design, so that no wrong *emblems* may be admitted, and above all that no piece of the mullions, or tracery, or cusps of the Window be cut away for it.’ (p. 18.)—*Part II.* Pub. by the *Ecclesiological Society.*

### [The Lectern.]

In the early ages of the Church there stood in the middle of the Nave,—of the Choir (Chancel), according to some authorities,—a kind of elevated Desk called the *Ambo* (ἀμβων), *Pulpitum*, or *Tribunal Ecclesiæ*, at which were read the portions of Scripture appointed in Divine Service answering to our modern “LESSONS,” and “EPISTLE,” and “GOSPEL.” This usage, as regards the “LESSONS,” has continued to prevail in some of our Cathedrals down to the present day; although the cumbrous and fixed *Ambo* has made way for the lighter and more moveable LECTERN (*Lecturn* or *Lettern*, Lectorium, Lectricium, Analogium): and from Cathedrals the practice was introduced prior to the Reformation into a few Parish Churches. In the latter, however, the *Lectern* since that time has been almost universally superseded by the *Reading-Desk*. There are

some cases in which the use of the *Lectern* has survived; and many more in which the practice has lately been restored. The position of the modern *Lectern* in those Parish-Churches where it now appears is usually just without the Chancel-arch, standing sometimes centrically, and sometimes on either side.

There exists, however, no Ecclesiastical authority, neither *Canon*, nor *Rubric*, which confers upon a Clergyman the privilege of introducing a *Lectern* at his will. He has nothing whatever to do with supplying the 'Ornaments' of the Church; which, as has been before observed, is a matter exclusively appertaining to the functions of the Churchwardens (see *supra* p. 480.). If, indeed, a *Lectern* were a necessary piece of Church furniture, those Parish Officers would be compelled to provide one.

The only *Rubric* bearing upon the question, and suggesting the admission of the *Lectern*, is the one directing when the 'LESSONS' are to be read, and which is as follows:—

¶. 'Then shall be read &c.....He that readeth so standing  
' ('the Minister that readeth the Lesson, standing:' 1549-1604),  
'and turning himself, as he may best be heard of all such as are  
' ('be:' 1549-1604) present.' (1662).—Present Book of Com. Pr.  
KEELING. 12.

The RUBRIC in the 'Communion-Office' of the first LITURGY of Edward VI. (1549), directing the reading of the 'Epistle' and 'Gospel,' refers certainly to a specific place; thus:—

'The Priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the  
'Epistle in a place assigned for the purpose, saying.'—  
(KEELING. 175.)

But the place was not defined, nor has this RUBRIC been retained in any of the subsequent Liturgies.

If, then, an Incumbent, prompted by his private interpretation of the RUBRIC, is desirous of reading

the 'Lessons' from a *Lectern*, in order that "he may best be heard," he is imperatively called upon, before introducing the usage, to anticipate objections, and remove the scruples, if any, that may exist in the minds of his Parishioners against such an innovation. If this be not done an appeal from them to the Ordinary would end, probably, in a peremptory injunction for the removal of the *Lectern*. In all matters, however, of this kind, especially when a possibility exists of any future unpleasantness arising, the sanction of the Bishop should be previously obtained.

In elucidating this subject it will be necessary to refer to those historical documents which speak of the ancient *Ambo*, the original, probably, of the modern *Lectern*, and of our present *Reading-Desk*, (see *READING-DESK, PULPIT, postea*); as well as to those likewise which bear upon the reading of the 'Lessons,' and the 'Epistle,' and 'Gospel.'

In 1547, among the *Injunctions* of Edward VI, is one ordering:— 'That, every Holy-Day throughout the year, when they have no Sermon, they shall immediately after the Gospel, openly and plainly recite to their Parishioners in the *Pulpit*, the "Pater-noster," the "Credo," and the "Ten Commandments," in English, to the intent the people may learn the same by heart.'— (*CARDWELL'S Doc. Ann.* i. 7). Another *Injunction* requires:— 'In the time of *High-Mass*, within every Church, he that saith or singeth the same, shall read or cause to be read the 'Epistle' and 'Gospel' of that Mass in English and not in Latin, in the *Pulpit*,\* or in such convenient place as the people may hear the same.'— (*ib.* 13; *SPARROW'S Coll* 3, 7.)

\* \* The term *Pulpit* in the above *Injunctions* implies, according to some, the *Rood-Loft*; according to others, the *Ambo*. (See *PULPIT, postea*).

---

\* ARCHDEACON HARRISON, commenting on this *Injunction*, says:—"There were not at that time, it will be recollected, *Reading-Desks* in the Churches; the Minister read the Service from his Seat, or Stall in the Quire. With regard to "*The Pulpit*" (the author here quotes an authority from a preceding page, which says:) "*The Pulpit*—a word meaning any high place—here alluded to is the *Rood-loft*, which seems very reluctantly to have given way to the present *Pulpit*. There are no Elizabethan Pulpits: and even GRINDALL only issues *Injunctions* to alter, not to destroy, "the *Rood-lofts*." But the Archdeacon himself does not appear to coincide with this opinion —*Historical Inquiry*, p. 51. n.

In 1571, 'GRINDAL enjoins at York that the 'Epistle' and 'Gospel' be read in the *Pulpit* or Stall,—meaning by the latter word 'the Priest's Stall in the Chancel of small Churches, and by *Pulpit*, the "decent low Pulpit" or *Desk* in which the Morning and Evening Services are ordered by him to be said in large Churches; not the *Sermon-Pulpit*, which is mentioned in 'another of his Injunctions as evidently different. (*Rem.* 132, '133).—(quoted in ROBERTSON'S *How shall we Conform to Lit.* p. 213.)—GRINDAL, when directing the 'COMMUNION SERVICE' to be read at the Communion-Table, adds:—'Except the Epistle and Gospel, which should be read in the said *Pulpit* (i. e. where reading was before appointed), or Stall.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 335.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723) writes:—'The *Ambo* itself was what we now call the *Reading-Desk*, a place made on purpose for the Readers and Singers, and such of the Clergy as ministered in the first Service, called "Missa Catechumenorum." It had the name of *Ambo*, not, as WALAFRIDUS STRABO imagines, '*ab ambiendo*,' because it surrounded them that were in it; but from *αναβαίνειν*, because it was a place of eminency, to which they went up by degrees or steps. For the original name is *ἀμβών*, which, . . . signifies the ascent or height of a mountain. And thence it comes to signify the place of eminency in the Church. SOZOMEN gives it the name of *βῆμα* (*bema*); but to distinguish it from the other *bema*, which was the Sanctuary or the Altar, he calls it *βῆμα γινωστών*, the Reader's *bema*, as the other was more properly the Bishops' and Presbyters' (l. viii. c. 5; l. ix. c. 2.). In St CYPRIAN it is called *Pulpitum*, and *Tribunal Ecclesiæ*, and the use of it is also explained by him to be a *Reading-Desk*: for here it was the Readers stood to read the Gospels and Epistles. (Ep. 33, '34). Here it was also that the Singers had their station, as is evident from the Canon of the Council of Laodicea (c. 15.), which forbids all others to sing in the Church beside the Canonical Singers, who went up into the *Ambo*, and sung by Book. Here also the diptychs or Books of Commemoration were read, as appears from a noted passage in the Council of Constantinople, under MENNAS, (Conc. v. Act. 5.), where the people cry out, τὰ δίπτυχα τῷ ἀμβωνί; "Let the Diptychs be laid upon the *Reading-Desk*." BONA thinks the Bishops and Presbyters here also made their *Sermons* to the people (*Rev. Lit.* ii. c. 6. n. 3.). . . But this observation seems to be founded upon a mistake.'—(*Antiq. of Christian Church.* viii. 5. §. 4.). Elsewhere, in speaking of the ancient form of ordaining 'Readers' to a 'station in the Church,' BINGHAM says:—'This was the *Pulpitum* or *Tribunal Ecclesiæ*, as it is commonly called in CYPRIAN, the *Reading-Desk* in the body of the Church, which was distinguished from the *Bema*, or *Tribunal* of the Sanctuary. For the Reader's office was not to read the Scriptures at the Altar, but in the *Reading-Desk* only. Whence '*super pulpitum imponi, et ad pulpitum venire*,' are phrases in CYPRIAN to denote the ordination of a *Reader* (Ep. 38, 39.). In this place, in Cyprian's time, they read the Gospels, as well as other parts of Scripture.'—(*ib.* iii. 5. §. 4. See also viii. 3.)

The REV. W. BATES says:—'LECTURNS or LETTERNS. The *Desks* in ancient Churches where the Epistle and Gospel were

'sung, certain Services for the Dead performed, and probably whence other 'Lessons' were read. They were sometimes of *brass*, 'in the form of an *eagle*, with outspread wings, to designate ST. JOHN, the Evangelist, and placed upon a Pedestal. The ANALOGIUM was a Reading-Desk of Spanish metal cast, on which was placed the Martyrology or Breviary; and the "Lessons" relating to the Saints were read from it.' (p. 324.)—*Lectures on Christn. Antiquities*.

The REV. R. HART observes;—'The *Ambo* was a large square Pulpit or Desk, ascended by two flights of steps, and standing in the centre of the Nave of a primitive Church. (BINGHAM viii. 5. §. 4. See *supra*). Here the Clergy stood while they recited that part of the Service at which the Catechumens, Penitents, and *Euerghumens* were allowed to be present.... The *Lectern*, or *Analogium*, was a moveable Reading-Desk, breast high, from which the Epistle and Gospel were read, and a few other parts of the Service (FOSB. i. 95.). Some of the existing specimens are of wood, like a double Desk turning on a pivot, and some of bronze, commonly like an *eagle*, or a *pelican*, with expanded wings.' (p. 244.)—*Eccles. Records*.

The REV. W. HEWETT merely remarks, while referring to the *Rubric* preceding the 'Lessons' appointing the Reader "to stand" and turn himself as he may best be heard.—'For this purpose a Desk called a "*Lectern*," or "*Lecturn*," has been very generally used; in Parish Churches it is placed just without the Rood-Screen, facing the Congregation.' (p. 8.)—*Arrangement of Parish Churches*.

DR. HOOK describes this 'Ornament of the Church,' thus:—LECTURN or LECTERN. The *Reading-Desk* in the Choir of ancient Churches and Chapels. The earliest examples remaining are of wood, many of them beautifully carved. At a later period it was commonly of brass, often formed of the figure of an *eagle* 'with outspread wings.'—Again, he defines, 'EAGLE, a frequent and the most beautiful form of the *Lectern* for reading the 'Lessons' from in Churches. It has probably some reference to the *eagle*, which is the symbolical companion of St John, in Ecclesiastical design.'—Again, he says of 'AMBO, a kind of raised platform or *Reading-Desk*, from which in the primitive Church, the Gospel and Epistle were read to the people, and sometimes used in Preaching. Its position appears to have varied at different times; it was most frequently on the north side of the entrance into the Chancel. The *Singers* also had their separate *Ambo*.'—*Church Dict.* 6th edit.

The REV. J. JEBB observes:—'In ancient times the Lessons were read from two *Pulpits* or *Ambo*s placed on each side of the Choir, facing north and south, which, however, unlike those monstrous *Pulpit-Desks* in modern London Churches, were never used for reading Prayers. The *Eagle-Desk* in our Choirs is the modified representative of the ancient *Ambo*. The regular position is in the centre of the Choir facing westward. In many old Parish Churches, as at Redcliffe Church, Bristol &c. the *Eagle-Desk* still exists, though not always used. In other places, as our Ritualists observe, the *Lesson-Desk* faced westward, and

‘that for Prayers eastward, or laterally. Till after the Restoration there was no instance, it is believed, of the Desk for Prayers facing westward. Those cumbrous pieces of carpentry which block up the Church, and contain both Bible and Prayer-Book, so that no visible change is marked from the acts of praise and prayer to that of instruction, were the innovation of the last century. In Dublin they are carried to their height, where they stand in the midst of the aisle, in the front of an enormous Pulpit, and are large enough to hold three or four Clergymen, a Clerk’s Desk, auctioneer-fashion, being placed beneath; and as in St Mary’s in Dublin, with the *Font* beneath that again. The usual position of the *Lectern* in Cathedrals carries out the direction and spirit of the Rubric...the lateral position of the *Eagle*, as at York, and Christ’s Church, Dublin, is obviously less conducive to this end than the usual central position. When the Capitular Members read the Lessons, they usually do so from their Stalls. But what is there to prevent them from going to the regular *Lectern*? a place surely of superior dignity in itself, and better fitted for audible recitation. It may be said that according to the ancient regulations of St Paul’s, before the Reformation, the Lessons were read by the Prebendaries, when they officiated, from their respective Stalls. But it ought to be remembered that not only was there then no regular *Lectern*, but that the edification of the people, such a main feature of the reformed Ritual was not then systematically sought.’ (p. 329). ‘The Lessons were read from a *Lectern*, usually a brazen *Eagle*, in the centre of the Choir, looking westward; as at St Paul’s, Lincoln, and many other Cathedrals, and Colleges. In foreign Churches, the *Eagle* commonly faces the east, and is used as a Desk for the Precentor, like the ancient *Ambo*, to hold the large Music-Book, at which the leaders of the Choir stand. Instances occur, however, of *Eagles* being used for the reading of the Epistle and Gospel. The *Eagle* at Canterbury, which formerly stood, as at York, and Christ Church in Dublin, at one side of the Choir, and was used for the Lessons, now faces the east, and forms a *Litany-Desk*. This is contrary to Anglican usage.’ (p. 194).—*Choral Service*.

The REV. G. A. POOLE says:—‘In reading to the people, the Minister should look towards them; as indeed the *Rubric* appoints before the “First Lesson.” In a small Church one *Desk*, with a Book-rail facing either way, to the east for the Prayer-Book, to the west for the ‘Lessons,’ will serve both purposes, and fully answer all these requirements; but in a large Church, where there is a *Lectern* in the centre of the Nave, this can only be done by having a separate *Lectern* at the east, and turned westward, for the ‘Lessons’ to be read from...The *Lectern* for this purpose might stand on the steps, by which the Chancel floor rises above the Nave. The *eagle* is by far the most beautiful form for this part of the Church’s furniture; and, as its use seems to have been suggested by the *eagle* being an emblem of St John the Evangelist, so that it is especially appropriate as a Desk from which the ‘Lessons’ are read, and as it has also abundant authority, no other need be mentioned....But it must be remembered that the *eagle* of the Church and of St John, is not the *eagle* of the heathens and of Jupiter....For the true Ecclesi-

'astical eagle, there is a glorious model in St Nicholas, Lynn, 'copies of which are to be had cast in brass.' (p. 96).—*Churches, Their Structure &c.*

The REV. J. E. RIDDLE states:—'In the earliest times, all portions of Scripture were read from a high Desk, called *Pulpitum*, (CYPRIAN uses this word), *Ambo* (ἀμβών, from ἀναβαίνειν), *Suggestus*, *Pyrgus* (πύργος, turris), *Tribunal*, *Lectricium*, or *Lectorium*. In later times, the common 'Lessons' were read from this Desk; but the Epistle and Gospel were read or sung at the Altar, the former on the left side by a Subdeacon, the latter on the right by a Deacon.' (p. 444).—The 'ἀμβών, *Ambo*, or, as it was also called, Βῆμα τῶν ἀναγινωσκῶν, *Suggestum Lectorum*, 'the Reader's Desk.' It was called *Ambo* from the Greek word ἀναβαίνειν, to mount or ascend; because the Desk was raised above the general surface of the Nave. In CYPRIAN (*Ep.* 33, 34.) we find it entitled *Pulpitum* (Pulpit), and *Tribunal Ecclesiæ* (to distinguish it from the Βῆμα, or Tribunal Chori). Here the Scriptures, and any other documents of public interest were read. The Sermon was usually preached in the Chancel; and the circumstance that CHRYSOSTOM, and AUGUSTINE, delivered their discourses from the *Ambo*, is mentioned as an exception to the general rule. The Gospel and Epistle were recited before the Altar, whence the division of the Altar into *Cornu Evangelii*, and *Cornu Epistolæ*. The Singers were stationed in or near the *Ambo* (Concil. Laod. c. 15); and the faithful sat round it, so that this was the chief place in the Nave, as the Altar was in the Choir or Chancel.' (p. 722).—*Christian Antiq.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON observes:—'Anciently they (Epistle and Gospel) were read from the *Ambon* or *Ambons*; for the arrangement of Churches varied as to this—some having an *Ambon* in the middle, while in others there was one on either side. DURANDUS uses the terms *Pulpit* and *Ambo* as synonymous (i. 32.). He says that the Epistle might be read either on the right hand, or in the middle of the Church.... The Epistle was read by the Subdeacon, the Gospel by the Deacon; they both read from the same *Ambon*, but in some Churches they went up to it by different ways (iv. 24). The Reader of the Epistle stood on a lower step, the Gospeller on a higher. (*ib.* 15; SCHMID ii. 134.). In the middle ages it was usual to chant the Gospel from the *Rood-loft*. (PUGIN. *Dub. Rev.* No. xxiii. p. 100). The *Sarum-Missal* (fol. ii—iii) orders that the Epistle be read sometimes from the *Pulpit*, sometimes "*ad gradum chori*;" and the Gospel from the same place with it. The Roman Missal seems to direct that they be read in advance of the Altar;—the Epistle on the south side, the Gospel on the north. (GAVANT. i. 202—4). The Readers stand on the floor of the Presbytery—i. e. the space between the Altar and the Stalls. (SCHMID ii. 134.).' (p. 212.) Elsewhere the author speaks of 'the Puritans, who in 1573 desired the removal of Fonts, "and also the brazen eagles, which were ornaments in the Chancels, and made for Lectures (Lecterns?)" As for the eagles they must be molten to make pots and basons for "new Fonts." (STRYPE'S *Parker*, 451)'—*How shall we Conform to Lit.* p. 238.

THE GLOSSARY of ARCHITECTURE describes the AMBO, as—'A *rostrum*, a kind of *Pulpit*... It appears, from the ground-plans of early Christian Churches, given by BINGHAM and others, that the name of *Ambo* was applied to a *Reading-Desk*, which was raised on two steps, and was sometimes situated near the west end of the Choir, immediately within the entrance, sometimes on one side, as in the Church of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem; in the larger Churches this would obviously be a more convenient situation to preach from than the steps of the Altar, then the usual place. The word '*Ambo*' is explained by DUCANGE as "*Pulpitum, Tribunal Ecclesiæ, ad quod gradibus ascenditur*" (Gall. Jube). DURANDUS in his *Rationale* says, "*Dicitur autem AMBO—quia gradibus ambitur*;" and he adds that in some Churches it was placed in the middle of the Choir, with two ascents to it by steps on each side, one from the east, the other from the west. In the upper part of the *Ambo* there were usually two steps, from the higher of which the Gospel was read, and from the lower the Epistle. There still remain some examples of the ancient *Ambo* in the Churches... at Rome.' (p. 17.)—The LECTERN is described as—'The *Desk* or *Stand* on which the larger Books used in the Services of the Roman Catholic Church are placed: since the Reformation they have been seldom used in this country, but are occasionally employed to hold the Bible. The principal *Lectern* stood in the middle of the Choir, but there were sometimes others in different places. They were occasionally made of stone or marble, and fixed, but were usually of wood or brass, and moveable; they were also often covered with costly hangings embroidered in the same manner as the hangings of the Altar. It is uncertain at what period the *Lectern* came into use'.... (here mention is made of several examples, the earliest of which is not higher than the 13th century, some are) 'made to receive a Book on one side only.'.... (others) 'with a Desk for a Book on four sides.... they are usually made with Desks on two sides only. The specimens of brass *Lecterns* are not so numerous as those of wood.... A common form for brass *Lecterns*, and one which is sometimes given to those of wood, is that of an *eagle*, or *pelican*, with the wings expanded to receive the Book, but they are also often made with two flat sloping sides, or desks, for Books.' In a Note is added:—'The use of the ancient *Lectern* has been almost entirely superseded in England by the modern *Reading-Desk*, or rather *Reading-pew*, which appears to have been frequently erected at the same time with the *Pulpit*, ordered by the CANONS of 1603 to be placed in every Church not already provided with one.' (p. 224)—4th Edit.

THE INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA furnishes no historical information, but merely gives specimens of *Oak Lecterns*. (PLATES. 2, 20, 24): and recommends the *Eagle Lectern* to be of brass in preference to wood.—(PLATE. 26.)

The Tract, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS" remarks:—'Wherever there is a *Lectern* with a large Bible or other Book chained to it, you should take much care of it. And even if the Books are gone the *Lectern* should be saved, and not left to lie about in some dark place. One would scarcely believe that any one would think a brass *eagle-desk* a piece of lumber; yet such is sometimes the case.' (p. 21)—PART II. Pub. by the *Ecclesiological Society*.



## [Lights, and Candlesticks]

## On the Communion-Table.

The placing of *Lights*, or of *Candlesticks with tapers*, upon the Communion-Table, has been of late years a very controverted subject. The discussion owes its origin to the awakened zeal of modern times for the restoration of Ecclesiastical order, and Church discipline; and the consequent advocacy of a stricter adherence to Canons and Rubrics, many of which have grown into desuetude, and many are very doubtful and obscure. Among those of an ambiguous character is the Rubric respecting the ‘Ornaments of the Church;’ under which appellation are classed the *Lights*, and *Candlesticks*, we are now considering. The RUBRIC enjoins that such “Ornaments” are “to be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VIth.,” and the point at issue is,—Whether the *Injunctions* of Edward VIth., put forth in 1546-7, and which contain the *only order* that can be produced for the admission of these Ornaments into our Parish Churches, had ‘the authority of Parliament’ required in this RUBRIC.

The *Injunctions* referred to, which were similar to those put forth by *Henry VIII*, were issued by the Privy Council between *May* and *August*, 1547, for the guidance of the Visitors in the Ecclesiastical Visitation set on foot in that year; and one of them directed :—

‘Item,....and shall suffer from henceforth no torches, nor candles, tapers, or images of wax to be set afore any image or picture, but *only two lights upon the High-Altar before the Sacrament, which for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world,\** they shall suffer to remain still.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 7.; SPARROW’S *Coll.* 2.

---

\* We find a *Constitution* of ABP. REYNOLD (A. D. 1322) running in these words:—‘At the Celebration of the Mass let *two*

This Injunction is supposed to possess the "*authority of Parliament*" by reason of the Statute 31 *Hen. VIII. c. 8.* (confirmed by 34 & 35 *Hen. VIII. c. 23*) giving to a *Royal Proclamation* the force of law; yet, a few months after these Injunctions had been issued this enactment was repealed by 1 *Edw. VI. c. 12. s. 5.* (*Dec. 1547.*); which has given rise to the opinion in some minds, that in the *second year* of Edward, (A. D. 1548.) these Injunctions had lost in consequence the '*authority of Parliament*;' but this can hardly have been the effect of that repealing statute. No other Royal Injunctions however bearing on this question were promulgated till the next Visitation, in *June, 1549*, the *third year* of Edward. In the mean time, the *second year* of this King gave birth to the *First LITURGY* of Edward VI., and the *Statute of Uniformity* (2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1. Jan. 21st, 1548-9*) enforcing the use of that LITURGY, on and after the approaching Whitsunday. *June 9th. 1549.* This was followed by fresh '*Injunctions*' in the *June* just mentioned, as well as by others in *December* of the same year, with the like object of ensuring the general adoption of the new LITURGY. Whence the prevailing opinion is that the '*authority of Parliament*' refers to the RUBRICS of the *First LITURGY* of Edward VI., which were enforced by an especial Statute, the *Act of Uniformity* (2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1*), passed *seven days* before the termination of Edward's *second year* (he having begun to reign *Jan. 28th, 1546-7*); and *not to the 'INJUNCTIONS'* of the *first year*.

---

'*Candles be lighted, or one at least.*' And in elucidation of the usage LYNDWOOD informs us that:—'*This Candle ought to be of wax rather than of any other substance; for such a Candle, when it burns, represents Christ himself, who is the Light of the World, for three reasons:—for it is composed of wax, a wick, and light: so also Christ consists of the flesh of the Virgin, generated without seed, as wax proceeds from the bee without generation. The wick being white, signifies the (human) soul of Christ with the whiteness of innocence. Lastly, the light represents his divinity united to the flesh.*' (WILKIN'S *Conc. ii. 513.*)—HART'S *Ecc. Records. p. 284*; ROBERTSON'S *How shall we Conform to the Liturgy. p. 313.*

On this specific point we have the opinion of MR. A. J. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*), who says:—

‘Supposing the *Injunctions* of 1547 to be what the RUBRIC refers to by the words “*by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.*,” it would seem that “*two lights*” upon the Communion-Table are *legal*; and that such is the construction of the RUBRIC appears to have been the opinion of BP. COSINS’ (*infra.*)... ‘But the fact is, that the Rubric cannot have reference to Edward’s *Injunctions* of 1547. Any argument that it has, must be grounded on the *Injunctions* having been *by authority of Parliament*; but they did not derive any authority from Parliament. The Statute, 31 *Hen. VIII. c. 8.*; the only thing that can have given rise to a supposition that they did, was repealed by Statute 1 *Edw. VI. c. 12. s. 5.*; therefore it could not have been said, that any “*Ornaments*” retained by, or in use under, the *Injunctions*, were retained or in use by the authority of Parliament. Besides the natural construction of the expression “*the authority of Parliament*” in this *Rubric*, is its referring to some exercise by Parliament of its authority, to some interference of Parliament, with regard to the subject of the Rubric. Parliament did not interfere till the “*second year of King Edward VI.*” It then did so by Statute, 2 & 3 *Edw. VI. c. 1.*; and we should remember that although the common use of the PRAYER BOOK, enacted by that Statute, was postponed by it until Pentecost, which was in the *third year* of Edward’s reign, yet the Statute itself took effect, and the Book was therefore adopted by Parliament from the commencement of the Session in which the Act passed: and that Session began on the 4th of November, 1548, the *second year* of Edward’s reign. Now this PRAYER BOOK prescribed “the use” of certain Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, but did not “retain” *Lights* among such Ornaments. The conclusion therefore is, that *Lights*, at least as Ornaments or symbols, either *two*, or in any other number, upon the Holy-Table in any Church or Chapel of the United Church of England and Ireland, are *not legal*. The foregoing observations were perused by the late DR. ELINGTON a few days before his lamented death; and he in a letter to the Editor said “I agree fully with you about the *Lights upon the Altar.*” (p. 1119)—*Book of Common Prayer*, E. H. S.

The *Injunction* of EDWARD VI., which we have been considering, is precisely similar to one issued in the time of HENRY VIII. A. D. 1536. by LORD CROMWELL, Vicar-General, as may be thus observed:—‘Ye shall...suffer from henceforth, no Candles, Tapers, or Images of wax to be set afore any Image or Picture, but only the *Light* that commonly goeth across the Church by the Rood-Loft, the *Light before the Sacrament of the Altar*, and the *Light about the Sepulchre*, which for the adorning of the Church and Divine Service ye shall suffer to remain still.’—WILKIN’S *Conc.* iii. 816.

We find also, that in 1538, and 1539, other Injunctions were issued, directing 'no other *Lights* to be used but that before the 'Corpus Christi.'—(*ib.* 842, 847.) In 1541, HENRY VIII. writes to *Cranmer*—'We by our Injunctions commanded that no offering or 'setting of *Lights* or *Candles* should be suffered in any Church, 'but only to the blessed Sacrament of the Altar.'—STRYPE'S *Cranmer*, 92.

Thus was the way prepared for that important *Injunction* of EDWARD VI. (in 1546-7) already quoted, wherein is said to rest our present authority; and in the same year we find CRANMER acting upon it, for the *Archbishop* inquires in his Visitation Articles (in 1547):—

'Whether they suffer any torches, *candles*, tapers, or any other 'Lights to be in your Churches but only two *Lights* upon the High-Altar.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 43; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 26.

Now, if this Injunction has not the 'authority of Parliament' required by the RUBRIC, it is of no legal force at the present day, and there is of course an end of the question. But if it is of actual binding authority, then we must consider what is strictly directed as to the fact, without involving ourselves in a discussion with regard to the symbolical meaning that may be attached to the usage. First, then, we find ordered, '*two Lights on the High-Altar before the Sacrament*:' this cannot be answered, it is generally said, by placing on the Communion-Table when the Lord's Supper is administered, merely *two Candlesticks with unlighted tapers*, (*lumina cæca*). Indeed there are not many Clergymen, we think, who in these times would attempt to burn *lights* at noon-day in our Churches, in order to fulfil the requirements of an Injunction till but lately buried in oblivion? Secondly, it is ordered that the '*two Lights shall be suffered to remain*.' This cannot be held to be a permission to introduce them where they were never found before. It surely, then, needs no demonstration to prove that an adherence to the strict letter of the rule would have prevented much of the disquietude that this subject has occasioned; for we do not find these '*Lights*' remaining in any of our Places of Wor-

ship : the only existing reminiscences of the usage are *two Candlesticks* ; and these are to be seen in some only of our Cathedrals, College and Private Chapels, and it may be in a few ancient Churches. It must be concluded, therefore, that the *introduction* of “ Lights ” into any Parish Church or Chapel has no authority to defend it ; and ‘ *to suffer to remain* ’ what has long lost its very existence is an absurdity ; so that ‘ *two Lights on the Communion-Table* ’ are the expired usages of a past age, and their revival amongst us now is *illegal*, and the authority put forth in defence of their introduction, a dead-letter.

As to *Candlesticks with unlighted tapers* on the Communion-Table as ‘ ORNAMENTS,’ for these there is, strictly speaking, no authority ; still if they have continued time immemorial in any Place of Worship, customary usage will allow them to *remain* undisturbed. But to *introduce* them into Parish-Churches where their appearance would be a perfect novelty, might not only be a dangerous experiment, but would be *contrary to law*. These measures, however, fall more especially within the function of the Churchwardens, and not of the Minister ; and for their conduct in this respect they are amenable by presentment to the Ordinary. Still, when *two Candlesticks with tapers* are placed on the Communion-Table to be in readiness for the EVENING SERVICE, and then are *lighted* to aid in illuminating the Chancel : this application of them may have been sanctioned by immemorial custom, but it cannot be defended by any Canonial, or Rubrical law. And the Churchwardens may be called to account for, what has been termed, such a conversion of the Communion-Table into a side-table or candelabrum, if the practice be objected to. The origin, and design of the ‘ *Lights* ’ upon the High-Altar, will be better understood by a perusal of the following evidences, and opinions.

In 1549, after the appearance of the *new LITURGY*, and the passing of the ‘ *Act of Uniformity* ’ enforcing its adoption, a *Royal Injunction* required :—‘ That all Parsons, Vicars, and Cu-

'rates omit in the reading of the Injunctions all such as make mention of the Popish Mass, of Chantries, of *Candles upon the Altar*, or any other such like thing. *Item*, For an uniformity, that no Minister do counterfeit the Popish Mass as to kiss the Lord's Table, &c....or setting any *Light upon the Lord's Board at any time*; and finally to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the King's Book of Common Prayer. &c.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 63.

\*.\* It may be observed that the '*Injunctions*' were usually read in Churches; and it appears from the above, that *Lights* and *Candles* were now forbidden.

In 1550, BP. RIDLEY in his Visitation Articles for the Diocese of London, inquires:—'Whether there be any Images in your Church...*Candles* &c.'—(*ib.* 80.). And he likewise enjoins:—'That there be no reading of such Injunctions as extollet and setteth forth the Popish Mass, *Candles*, Images, Chantries, &c. *Item*, That no Minister do counterfeit the Popish Mass in kissing the Lord's Board....or setting any *Light upon the Lord's Board*.'—(*ib.* 81.)

On the Accession of MARY, however, we find these *Lights* &c. are restored:—In 1555, the Legatine constitutions of CARDINAL POLE enjoin:—'Ut perpetuo *lampas* vel *cereus* coram sanctissimo hoc sacramento *ardeat*.'—(*ib.* 147.)

In 1557, CARDINAL POLE inquires:—'Whether there do burn a *lamp* or a *candle* before the Sacrament, and if there do not, that then it be provided for with expedition.'—(*ib.* 174.)

ELIZABETH on coming to the throne appeared anxious to restore religious matters to the position they occupied at the death of Edward VI, yet we find from the '*Zurich Letters*' that *Lights* were retained in the Royal Chapel. SAMPSON writes to PETER MARTYR (Jan. 6th, 1559—60), 'What can I hope for when the Ministry of Christ is banished from the Court, but the image of the Crucifix is admitted with *Lights burning*....The Altars indeed are removed....in the Court alone the image of the Crucifix with *Candles* is retained.'—And he puts the question: 'Whether an image of a Crucifix placed upon the Table of the Lord with *Candles lighted*, whether, I say, this is to be reckoned, among things indifferent.'—*Zur. Lett.* Ep. 27.

In 1562, 1563, BP. PARKHURST in Letters to BULLINGER mentions the same practice. (*ib.* Ep. 53. 57).—In the HOMILY '*Against the Peril of Idolatry*,' Pt. III. (*pub.* in 1562) the usage is thus censured:—'In the day it needeth not, but was ever a proverb of foolishness to light a *Candle* at noon time.' (*p.* 241.)—*Chr. K. Soc.* Edit. 12mo.

In 1567, BPS. GRINDAL, and HORN, in a Letter to GUALTER, say:—'Accensos *cereos* et ejus generis alia, ex legum præscripto nunquam revocanda, penitus amisit ecclesia Anglicana.'—*Zur. Lett.* Ep. 75.

BP. JEWEL'S opinion.—HARDING having reproached the Reformers with 'raising up the heresy of Vigilantius in refusing

'to...keep Lights in Churches, to the honour of God,' (*Apol.* p. 12); says also, 'If *Lights* at the Gospel and Communion be not had...judge ye whether ye have duly kept the old ceremonies of the Church.' (*ib.* 19).—To this JEWEL replies: 'Touching your *Lights* and *Tapers*, Beatus Rhenanus, a man of great learning and judgment, doubteth not hut ye borrowed the use thereof from the heathens. I grant, the Christians in old time had *Lights* in their Churches when they met together at their Common Prayers. But it appeareth by the ancient Fathers that the same *Lights* served to solace them against the dark, and not for any use of religion...So likewise saith S. HIEROME, "*Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus*"—*contr.* *VIG. c.* 3: (We light not our *Tapers* at mid-day, but only by this comfort to ease the darkness of the night).—*Def. of Apol.* p. 21. (Works, fol. 1611).

In 1576, GRINDAL, *Abp. of Canterbury*, inquires:—'Whether legacies have been left for providing obits, diriges, trentals, torches, lights, lamps, tapers, or any such like use, now by law forbidden.'—*Remains.* 173.

In 1628, NICHOLAS FERRAR bad in his Church at Little Gidding 'two large wax candles on the Communion-Table.'—*WORDS. Eccl. Biog.* IV. 176.

In 1633, ABP. LAUD strongly advocated in Cathedrals—'Candlesticks, bason, and carpet;' (HEYLYN'S *Life of Laud.* 274. 491).

In 1641. It was one of the Charges brought against the Laudian divines before the Committee of the House of Lords, that of 'advancing *Candlesticks* in many Churches upon the Altar, so called.'—*CARDWELL'S Conf.* 272.

### And now for a few opinions.

BP. ANDREWES (*ob.* 1626) considered that the early Church did not make use of *Lights* with any mystical meaning, adding:—'But, as it is thought, for this cause, that when the Christians, in time of persecution, had their meetings in *cryptis*, in caves and grots under ground, places dark, and so needing light,—after, when peace came, though they had Churches then above ground, with light enough, yet retained they the *Lights*, to shew themselves to be the sons and successors of those ancient Christians which in former times had used them, though upon other occasion — shewing their communion in the former faith by the communion of the former usages; whereto the after ages devised meanings and significations of their own which from the beginning were not so.' (*p.* 18).—*Answer to Perron's XVIIIth Chapter.*

DR. CAVE (*ob.* 1713) states:—'By reason of the darkness of these places, and their frequent assembling there in the night, to avoid the fury of their enemies, they were forced to use *lights* and *lamps* in their public meetings; but they who make this an argument to patronize their burning of *lamps* and *wax-candles* in their Churches at noon-day (as it is in all the great Churches of the Roman Communion) talk at a strange rate of wild inconsequence.'—*Prim. Christ.* i. 7. p. 203.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723) refers to the ancient practice spoken of by GREGORY NAZIANZEN of carrying *Lighted Tapers* among the ceremonies following Baptism. (*Antiq. of Chr. Church* xii. 4. §. 4); and he subsequently quotes the passage of ST JEROM (*contr. Vigilant.* c. 3.) with respect to the carrying of *Lights* before the Gospel when it was read, as cited by BP. JEWEL. *Jerom* says—*‘They had no such custom in the Western Church, either as burning candles by day at the monuments of the Martyrs (as VIGILANTIUS falsely accused them), nor at any other time, save only when they met in the night, to give light to their assemblies: but in the Eastern Church it was otherwise; for without any regard to the relics of the Martyrs, whenever the Gospel was read, they lighted Candles, partly to demonstrate their joy for the good news which the Gospel brought, and partly by a corporeal symbol to represent that light of which the Psalmist speaks, “Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light unto my paths.” I know no other author besides ST JEROM that mentions this, and as far as his authority will prevail it may be credited, and no further. DR. CAVE judges it might not be much older than his time (Prim. Christ. i. 7. 203.): however it was, it is no argument to patronize the burning of lamps and wax-candles, without the same reason, in Churches at noon-day.’—Antiq. of Chr. Ch. xiv. 3. §. 11.*

BP. COSINS, (*ob.* 1671) commenting upon the Rubric of the Liturgy respecting “*Ornaments*,” says:—*‘Among other Ornaments of the Church that were then in use, the setting of two Lights upon the Communion-Table or Altar was one, appointed by the King’s Injunctions (set forth about that time, and mentioned or ratified by the Act of Parliament here named [Stat. of Uniformity], whereby all other wax-lights and Tapers, which in former times of superstition men were wont to place upon their Shrines and Images and Saints, being taken away and utterly abolished, it was required that two Lights only should be placed on the Altar, to signify the joy and splendour we receive from the Light of Christ’s blessed Gospel.—Bene B. Lutherus in formulâ Missæ sive Communionis, quam Wirtenhurgensi Ecclesiæ anno superioris seculi vicesimo tertio præscripsit, Nec Candelas (inquit), nec thurificationem prohibemus, sed nec exigimus; esto hoc liberum.’ (p. 18.). . . . When describing the order for the administration of the Lord’s Supper, BP. COSINS says:—‘The Table or Altar should be spread over with a clean Linen Cloth, or other decent covering; upon which the Holy Bible, the Common-Prayer-Book, the Paten and Chalice, are to be placed: two wax Candles are to be set on;’ &c. (p. 34.). . . . And again he says:—‘Upon the Table also, besides the Linen Cloth, and other needful furniture, were to be placed Two Lights,’ &c. (p. 37.)—Add. Notes to NICHOLL’S Com. Pr.*

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742), in his comments on the first RUBRIC, remarks:—*‘Among other Ornaments of the Church then in use, there were two Lights enjoined by the Injunctions of King Edward VI (which Injunctions were also ratified by the Act of Parliament here mentioned) [the last Act of Uniformity] to be set upon the Altar, as a significant ceremony to represent the light which Christ’s Gospel brought into the world. And this too was ordered by the very same Injunction which prohibited all*



'other lights and tapers, that used to be superstitiously set before  
'Images or Shrines, &c. (SPARROW'S *Coll.* 2, 3.); and these *Lights*,  
'used time out of mind in the Church, are still continued in most, if  
'not all, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chapels, so often as  
'Divine Service is performed by candle-light; and ought also,  
'by this RUBRIC, to be used in all Parish Churches and Chapels at  
'the same time.' (p. 105).—*Rat. Ill. of B. of Com. Pr.*

The late BISHOP OF MEATH (*Dr. Stopford*), speaking of *Lights*,  
says:—'Perhaps this practice has been innocent hitherto, but the  
'*introduction of Lights* at present is intended to lead through the  
'thick darkness which overspreads Rome. Contrary to the nature  
'of light, this dim light is calculated to extinguish the bright  
'Light within.'—(quoted in STEPHEN'S *B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.  
p. 1120.)

Before expressing our own conclusions it will be  
better that we should cite a few modern authorities.

The BISHOP OF LONDON (*Dr. Blomfield*) observes:—'A question  
'has arisen about placing *Lights* upon the Communion-Table.  
'Some doubt may be entertained as to the law in this particular.  
'They were forbidden by the Injunctions of Edward VI. in 1549;  
'but they were in use when the first LITURGY of that monarch re-  
'ceived the authority of Parliament, and therefore seem to be  
'sanctioned by the Rubric in our present Common Prayer-Book.  
'But whether it be so or not, they have always been retained in the  
'*Chapels Royal*, in *Cathedrals*, and in *College Chapels*; and I see  
'no objection to them, provided that the Candles are not burning  
'except when the Church is lighted up for Evening Service.' (p.  
48)—*Charge.* 1842.

The BISHOP OF DURHAM (*Dr. Maltby*), in answer to certain  
complaints made by the Parishioners with respect to the manner of  
performing Divine Service in Heworth Church, replied on this  
subject, thus:—'Objections having been made by certain Pa-  
'rishioners to the placing certain *Candlesticks* upon the Com-  
'munion-Table, I disallow such objections, and permit the placing  
'there of such *Candlesticks*; but I order and direct that the *Can-*  
'*dles be not lighted, except when required for lighting the said*  
'Church during late Evening Service.'—*Eccles. Gazette.* Septem-  
ber, 1852. p. 69.

The REV. W. GOODE says:—'Lights upon the Communion-  
'Table not being among the Ornaments sanctioned by that Book  
'(the first Common Prayer-Book of Edward VI.), are not in-  
'cluded in those enjoined by the Rubric; and this Rubric being  
'the only authority for them, the question respecting the legality  
'of the practice is at once determined.' (p. 76)... Referring to the  
Injunction of Edward VI, he continues—'The Injunction has not  
'in any way, directly or indirectly, any force at the present day;  
'and, in fact, retained its force for a very brief period.... These  
'Injunctions never were equivalent to an Act of Parliament; nor  
'had they in any way the sanction of Parliament. Consequently,  
'these directions can derive no authority from the Rubric in  
'question, and are therefore altogether destitute of force at the

' present day. Nor can the practice be defended on the ground of custom, because the Acts of Uniformity limit us to the observances 'laid down in the Book of Common Prayer.' (p. 77). . . . After referring to certain Visitation-Articles he adds:—'Not only, therefore, was there no "Authority of Parliament" for these *Lights* in the second year of Edw. VI. (or indeed at any time), but the authority of Parliament in that year *excluded* them, by limiting the ceremonial of our Church to what was prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer thus authorized. (p. 79). . . . I am unable to draw a distinction between Candles *lighted* and *unlighted*. The practice is contended for as a ceremony of religious signification, and is maintained solely by the authority of an Injunction that requires "*Lights*," and requires them for a symbolical purpose. If then the Injunction is to be followed, the Candles must be *lighted*. If it is not to be followed, there is no authority for the candles even *unlighted*. No doubt, if *Lights* are required on the Communion-Table for *lighting the Church* when the Service is performed by candle-light, and *unlighted candles* are placed on the Communion-Table in the former part of the day, with the intent (real or professed) that they may be ready for that purpose, it might be hardly worth while, in ordinary cases, to notice such a practice. But as it is open to the supposition that there is a superstitious object in view in placing them there, it is surely a wiser course, and certainly looks more honest, not to adopt such a practice. And I suppose few will think it can produce any good effect upon the minds of the worshippers, to have *unlighted candles* upon the Table at the administration of the Communion, or at any other time. A *bad* effect it *may* produce in more ways than one; and one certainly is, that if noticed at all, it can only provoke a smile, as a palpable absurdity.'—(p. 80). MR. GOODE, in a *Note*, contradicts the assertion of WHEATLY, that the Injunction had the authority of Parliament; and likewise corrects the misapprehension of that author that *Lights* 'ought to be used in all Parish Churches,' — 'But the direction was, that they were to be "before the Sacrament," and the Sacrament is ordinarily administered by day-light. And it is this religious, or rather superstitious, use of them in connexion with the Sacrament, which is objectionable. No one, I suppose, would object to any number of *lights being placed upon the Communion-Table for the purpose of lighting the Church*, when "Divine Service is performed by Candle-light." (p. 77.)—*Ceremonial of Church of England*.

DR. HOOK speaks very fully on this subject; after quoting the *Injunction* of Edward VI, he proceeds:—'Some persons who are ignorant of the history of those times, object that this Injunction is not to the purpose, because we have no *High-Altar*: the truth is, that it is the *High-Altar* alone which is left in our Churches, all the rest being removed by authority, on account of the idolatrous and corrupt practices which were connected with them. It is also objected by some . . . that "*the Sacrament*" before which, on the Altar the *Lights* were to remain, is taken away: for by this term, say they, was meant the *consecrated wafer*, suspended in a *Pyx* on the Altar. If, then, this is taken away, so also must the *Lights* be taken away which were to burn before it. But even

'allowing that the Sacrament, in this sense, is removed, yet the  
 'Injunction gives another reason for *Lights*, and may surely be  
 'allowed to speak its meaning better than those who must, to  
 'serve their turn, give to it an idolatrous meaning. The In-  
 'junction does not say that the *Lights* are to remain before the  
 'Sacrament as an additional kind of adoration of the host, but *for*  
 'the signification that CHRIST is the very true light of the world.  
 'It would be very illiberal to suppose that those who quarrel with  
 'the *Lights* deny the truth which they are thus made by authority  
 'to symbolize; but it is really strange that they will overlook this  
 'sound reason given by the Injunction, in order to set forth a  
 'questionable reason not given, by way of getting rid of the ob-  
 'noxious *Lights*. . . . From the time of Edward, there seems never  
 'to have been a time when the *Lights* were not retained in *Cathedral Churches*, and wherever we might look for an authorita-  
 'tive interpretation of the law. And to the present day the *Candles*  
 'are to be seen on the altar of almost all the *Cathedrals*. In  
 'Collegiate Churches, also, they are usually found; and so also in  
 'the *Chapels Royal*, and in the *Chapels* of the several *Colleges*  
 'in *Oxford* and *Cambridge*. The use of these ornaments in  
 '*Oxford* and *Cambridge* is a matter of special importance, for it  
 'serves to give a singular character to the objection which some,  
 'even of the Clergy, make to the *Candles* on the ground of novelty.  
 'Almost every Clergyman must again and again have seen on the  
 'Altar of his *College Chapel* these appropriate and symbolical  
 'ornaments; and yet some Clergymen, when they wish to condemn  
 'them elsewhere, so far forget what they have seen as to call them  
 'a novelty. In how many *Parochial Churches*, or *Chapels* of  
 'ancient *Chapelries*, or *Private Chapels*, in this kingdom, *Candles*  
 'on the Altar have been retained since the times of the Puritans, we  
 'know not; in some they certainly have been: but surely the  
 '*Rule of the Church being express for their use*, the custom of  
 'those whose Ritual and Furniture is most carefully maintained  
 'under the eye of persons best qualified to judge in such matters,  
 'and the guardians of the Church's constitution, is sufficient, at  
 'the very least, to serve as a witness to the rule and to make it  
 'clear that it is still the *Rule, the acknowledged Rule, of the Church*  
 '*of England*. Thus, then, the custom of the Church is with those  
 'who use, and not with those who omit the use of, *Lights*, although  
 'custom is an argument brought confidently against them. And  
 'here also we may note that all the *Commentators* on the Prayer  
 'Book, whose judgment we would look to with respect, agree  
 'in declaring that it is the law and the custom of the Church of  
 '*England* to retain the two *Lights* on the Altar. That their use  
 'has been, however, too much neglected, cannot be denied; but, in  
 'fact, the disuse of *Lights*, where they have been disused, when it  
 'is traced to its real cause, tells almost as much in their favour  
 'as the continued use of them where they are retained. It was not  
 'our Reformers who removed them from the Altar; we have  
 'already proved that they deliberately commanded their use: it  
 'was the Puritans, who took their origin in the days of Queen  
 'ELIZABETH, from the refugees in Holland and Geneva during  
 'the persecutions of the bloody Queen MARY.'..(after quoting the  
 'remark of ST. JEROME we have already given under BINGHAM, he  
 'adds)—'It seems not at all improbable that ABP. THEODORE,

'coming as he did from Tarsus, may have introduced this custom of the Eastern Church (burning Lights at the reading of the Gospel) among the Anglo-Saxons. The mention of *Lamps* and *Candlesticks* among Church Furniture occurs in very early times....probably A. D. 296, a few years before the breaking out of the tenth persecution....Many records are found of the use of *Candlesticks* and *Lamps* in our National Church from the time of BEDE to the Norman Conquest, particularly a remarkable List of Church Books and Furniture, which is to be found in the will of LEOFRIC, Bp. of Exeter, in the time of Edward the Confessor.'—*Church Dict. Art. "LIGHTS ON THE ALTAR."*

The REV. J. JEBB observes:—'The Ornaments of the Church, besides those stated before, may be considered as chiefly consisting of the *two Lights on the Communion-Table*, which immemorial custom had always prescribed, at least in *Cathedrals*, and *Collegiate* and *Royal Churches* and *Chapels*. In many of those places they are still retained; in many where they are disused, the disuse could be shown to be modern: and some *Parish Churches*, and *Private Chapels* of noblemen, have uniformly retained them: they always stood on the Altar, and were lit when the Service was performed by candle-light....The custom is not Popish: the custom of having *large lights*, which were lit even in the day, during the most sacred part of Places of Worship, derived perhaps from the use of the seven-fold Candlestick in the Jewish Temple, or from the Synagogue of the Jews, was retained universally in the Greek Church, and all over the world....The *seven lights* used in Romish Churches, were not, it is believed, employed in England, where there were but *two*, even before the Reformation. The use of these *Lights*, emblematical of the Light of the Gospel, cannot surely be termed "a dark or dumb ceremony, but is so set forth, that every man may understand what it doth mean, and to what use it doth serve." The custom has never been obsolete in our Church; it is Catholic, and approved by our formularies, and ought therefore to be retained.' In a *Note* is added—"It has been conjectured that these *Lights* were forbidden by subsequent Injunctions. But these Injunctions are of doubtful construction, and are unconfirmed by any subsequent enactment of Church or State, and, at all events, the custom of the Church of England has been as here stated.' (p. 212—14)—*Choral Service*.

The Rev. F. C. MASSINGBERD says:—"It does not seem that this *Injunction* (of 1547) for having the *Lights upon the Altar* is now of force. They were to be placed *before the Sacrament*. Transubstantiation was still the doctrine of the English Church: and as the Host was always kept upon the Altar, the *Lights* were probably in honour of the supposed corporeal presence of the Redeemer; whereas in the *Injunctions* put forth A. D. 1549, after the passing of the Act of Uniformity, the Clergy were ordered to omit the reading of all such (previous) Injunctions "as make mention of the Popish Mass, of Chuntries, of *Candles upon the Altar*, or any such like thing." (p. 344. n).—*The English Reformation* 2nd. ed.

The REV. G. A. POOLE remarks on this furniture:—"The authority to which its introduction is usually referred, expressly

‘recognizes its symbolical use; which is not the case with any other part of the arrangement of our Churches, although there can be no question that they are symbolical to a very great extent, and that for this they were first employed, and afterwards retained. But of the *Lights upon the Altar* the Injunction of King Edward expressly says, that they are TO REMAIN for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the World: we may add that the number being limited to two, marks also a reference to the two natures, the manhood and the godhead, in the One Person of our Blessed Lord.’ (p. 107.)—*Churches, their Structure &c.*—(For fuller arguments the Reader is referred to this Author’s Pamphlet on ‘*The Lights on the Communion-Table.*’)

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, after bringing forward various historical evidences with respect to the use of *Candles* on the Communion-Table, to whose work we may refer our Readers for much valuable information, thus writes:—‘It does not appear that it ever was enjoined (in Parish-Churches) by any Bishop. There is nothing of the kind in the Norwich Articles of WREN, and MONTAGUE.... I have also looked into some of the venomous little pamphlets of charges against Parochial Clergymen of the Laudian School, without observing any mention of Candles; whence we may conclude that the use of them was not general even among the most ceremonial of the Parochial Clergy. Puritans never complain of being obliged to set up *Candles*; they are not enjoined or inquired after by any Bishop whose Articles have fallen in my way, from PARKER to KEN, although so many other ornaments and articles of furniture are mentioned, that these could not have been omitted if they were held necessary.... It would appear rather, that they have never been restored in Parish Churches since their removal under Edward VI; that they were removed before that period of his reign to which the *Rubric* refers us for the list of ornaments; that when the ornaments of Edward’s Second year were restored by the Rubric of 1559, the *Lights* were not supposed to be included among them; and, which is the most important fact, that as they were connected with the practice of hanging “the Sacrament” over the Altar, the discontinuance, and authoritative condemnation of that practice would in any case do away with the force of Edward’s Injunction in their favour. They were re-established in the Royal Chapels by ELIZABETH not from any authority of the Church, but because of her own personal taste; they have been ever since continued in *Royal Chapels*, and, after that model, were adopted in many *Private Chapels* of Bishops and lay noblemen, as also in *Colleges*. They seem to have been wanting in most or all *Cathedrals* until the time of LAUD, and to have been generally retained in Churches of this class since the Restoration of CHARLES II. I believe, therefore, that in the places where these ornaments have a degree of authority, that authority is derived from some other source than the Rubric now under consideration; and that there is no authority whatever for using them in Churches and Chapels of the Parochial class. If, however, they could be introduced without any superstitious assertion of their necessity on the one hand, or equally superstitious alarm on the other, they might, it is conceived, form an innocent and not unsuitable decoration.... As to the lighting of the Candles. This is certainly meant in the In-

'junction of 1547: Queen ELIZABETH's *Lights* were burning when she first exhibited the obnoxious ornaments; and although a change was soon made in this respect, and MELVILLE found the *Candles* in her successor's Chapel *lumina cæca*, it appears that the practice of lighting was revived on some occasions (probably at Communion) in Whitehall Chapel during the reign of CHARLES I. Together with this fact as to the Chapel-Royal, we learn that the *Candles* in LAUD's Chapel at Lambeth were *not lighted*. (RUSHW. ii. 279)... With the exception of those in the Royal Chapels, it would seem that the *Candles* of that time were *not lighted*... Although this was the practice of the school of Laud, it is very evident, as has been said already, that *any one who may think himself bound by the Rubric to set Candles on the Altar, ought also to consider himself bound to light them.*' (pp. 90—94). Subsequently commenting upon the last clause of the Injunction, "they shall suffer to remain still," the author continues:—'*Suffer, out of consideration for the feelings of people who had been used to see Lights in their Churches, to remain in places where they had previously been. I believe that the authority for the use of these Lights has been entirely done away with; but if it were not, I should hold a Clergyman perfectly justified in not attempting now-a-days at once to restore them. For a permission that they may remain, is not an order that they shall be set up where they were not before; Lighted Candles are as offensive to the popular religion of this day, as they were congenial to that of the year 1547.... Our flocks too commonly will see nothing in them for the present but badges of popery, or in the language of CARTWRIGHT and his brethren, "remnants of Anti-christ,"*' (BANCROFT. *Dang. Por.* ii. c. 9) "a very sacrament of abomination" (ap. HOOKER. v. 29. 5). Would it be wise, then, to vex people with an offensive symbol of a truth which they profess fully to believe, and which they refuse to see in the symbol? And in fact the mystical meaning for which the Lights were suffered to remain is now needless.' (pp. 311—312). In a Note is added:—'*Nor can it be said that we are bound by primitive authority to burn Lights on our Altar.... The Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. i. 5.) refers Lights to apostolical tradition. The first witness for their being placed on the Altar at Mass is Innocent III., who became Pope in 1198: earlier testimonies not reaching to this point. (SCHMID ii. 39.)' &c. &c. (p. 313).—How shall we Conform to the Lit.*

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) states:—'*The Churchwardens ought also, in strictness, to provide.... two Lights to be placed upon the Altar before the Sacrament, for the signification that Christ is the very light of the world.*' (p. 44).—*Chw. Guide.*

MR. A. J. STEPHENS (*Barrister-at-Law*) in addition to what has been already cited (in p. 657). says:—'*Though it might admit of a question whether the very ancient and universal custom of burning Lights during the Communion Office was ever abrogated by the permanent laws of our Church, still, that custom, now plainly obsolete, is very different from retaining Candlesticks on the Altar with Tapers to be lit when they are required.... For their use on the Holy-Table at Evening Service, we have the continuous sanction of Cathedrals, Royal*

'Chapels, and Colleges, down to the time of the Rebellion; and 'it could be, and has been, very amply shewn that the replacing 'these Articles of Ecclesiastical furniture at the Restoration was 'very frequent.' .... (After quoting the observations of Bp. COSINS given above, he proceeds)—'It is difficult to believe that 'had this been unlawful, the practice should have been so largely 'sanctioned by the heads of the Church, especially of those who 'revised the Prayer-Book. After all, are *Candlesticks* and *Lights* 'mere ornaments? They are something more; though ornamental 'in themselves, and in the position they occupy, they are for 'use, and are properly Church furniture; and therefore no more 'within the contemplation of the Rubric respecting Ornaments, 'than the Stalls, Desks, &c.... There appears no sound reason, 'why, when the Church must of necessity be lit, the ancient custom 'of lighting the Chancel by means of *two Candlesticks* on the 'Holy-Table, should not be kept up according to ancient and 'unbroken usage.' (p. 1120)—*Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S.

THE HIERURGIA ANGLICANA, (published by 'The Ecclesiological Society,') furnishes several examples of the use of *Lights* in Cathedrals, and Royal, and Private Chapels, and some few Parish-Churches, to which we must refer our Readers who may wish for further testimony.

THE INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA, speaking of *Altar-Candlesticks*, says:—'They may be made of latten, or, of course, of more 'costly metal: they admit also of costly enamelling and decoration. 'It is a mistake to use very high *Candlesticks*: those figured in 'the Plate are half the full size (full size is 13in; 14in; or 19in.). 'In these, as in Chalices, a knop is not to be dispensed with. They 'must have also a *spreading bowl*, and a *pricket*, or *spike*. The '*Candles*, which must also be moderately short, are made to 'taper, and to drop on to the pricket. They may be burnt 'nearly as low as the tops of the prickets: the ends ought to be 'returned to the wax-chandler, who makes a fair allowance for 'them, as he uses the wax again.... The *Altar-Candlesticks* 'ought not to stand on the Table of the Altar, but on a *super-Altar*, or raised step: which is often indeed a ledge in the east 'wall.'—*Plates.* 57. 61.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, commenting on the passage in the Bp. OF LONDON'S *Charge* on this subject which we have quoted (in p. 663.), proceeds to cite the *Injunction* of Edw. VI. of 1547, adding:—'And these "*two lights on the High Altar*" are 'equally allowed in ABP. CRANMER'S Visitation Articles, 2 Edw. VI. 'We do not find that the subsequent Injunction in 1549 positively 'forbids them, but it directs that Ministers shall *omit the reading* 'of that part of the former Injunction which authorizes the '*two candles*; and they may be considered as expressly prohibited 'by Queen ELIZABETH'S 'Injunctions,' 1559, under the general 'term of '*Candlesticks*,'—as they had before that time been 'inferentially forbidden by the abolition of Altars. We cannot 'presume to dispute the Bp. OF LONDON'S opinion that these 'prohibitions are abrogated by the general Rubric which he 'quotes, and there is no doubt that in *Cathedrals*, *Colleges*, and 'perhaps some *ancient Churches*, this practice has been continued 'to our day; and we have no wish to see it in such a case altered;

‘but the real question is—shall they be now introduced as a *general ceremonial in places where they have never before been heard of?* Surely the BP. OF LONDON must know that those who introduce these *Lights* into *new places* do not do so for any pretence of their utility, or if they do, that it is a mere pretence. The object—the plain, and, we believe, avowed object—is to imitate the *Popish Altar*, and his Lordship seems to sanction that imitation. He will not, indeed, allow the *Candles* to be actually burning at noon-day; but why should they be seen at all where they have never been before? We have a great reverence for the Communion-Table; nay, we have no Puritanical objection to call it God’s *Altar*,—the altar where the sacrifice of our Saviour is—not *made*, but—*commemorated*—but then the higher we carry our reverence for the *Altar*, the less are we disposed to see it degraded into a side-table on which *Candles* are placed merely to help to light the Church at *Evening Service*; still less can we tolerate that, under such a shallow pretence, it should be made a vehicle of Popish superstitions—for such, with all deference to King Edward’s and Abp. Cranmer’s original toleration of the practice, we cannot but consider that the revival of it at this day would be. The *lighting the Church*, we apprehend, belongs neither to the Bishop nor Minister, but to the *Churchwardens*; and, if it were really a question of mere *lighting*, has, we think, no claim to the honour of the Bishop’s notice; and if it be any thing more, we now, with all deference, think that it *requires to be forbidden at once, and without reserve*; and we should have the rather expected this, because the BP. OF LONDON has expressed himself, in the very next sentence, decidedly against an analogous, but, as it seems to us, not more dangerous innovation.’ (decorating the Communion-Table with *Flowers*—See *supra*).—NO. cxliii. May 1843. p. 272.

\*.\* Our space will not admit of further quotation; but if additional information is required, we must refer our Readers to certain Pamphlets which have been lately published on the subject of “*Lights on the Communion-Table*,” one written by the Rev. A. P. Perceval, one by the Rev. G. A. Poole, and a third under the anonymous signature, “*By a Layman*.”

It must now, we think be evident, from the opinions above cited, conflicting though they be, that to attempt to set up *Lights*, or *Candlesticks with tapers*, upon the Communion-Table in Parish Churches, without Episcopal sanction, or even with the approval of the Diocesan, if it should be in defiance of the feelings of our Congregations, must give rise to many bitter heart-burnings, and be productive of the most deplorable consequences.

[The Litany-Stool.]

The *Litany-Stool*, called also the *Litany-Desk*, or *Fald-Stool*, is not distinctly recognized by any



Canonical or Rubrical authority now of force, and cannot therefore be capriciously introduced into Parish Churches. Its use has survived in some of our Cathedrals, and, like the "Lights upon the Altar," depends in some measure upon the *Injunctions* of EDWARD VI, and the force of custom, for its continuance in those leading Ecclesiastical establishments. But these circumstances will not of themselves sanction the appearance of the *Litany-Stool* in our ordinary Places of Worship; nor indeed shall we find any *Royal Injunction* mentioning even a *Litany-Stool*. The Injunctions merely prescribe the *place* of saying the 'Litany,' and it is by implication only that a *Stool*, or *Desk*, becomes an indispensable piece of furniture for fulfilling the requirements of such order.

The direction of the 15th CANON (of 1603—4), however, which is the only authority we possess on the subject binding upon us at this day, refers the appointment of the *place* for saying the LITANY to the Ordinary, thus:—

The *Litany* shall be said or sung...in all Cathedral, Collegiate, Parish Churches and Chapels, in some convenient *place*, according to the discretion of the Bishop of the Diocese, or Ecclesiastical Ordinary of the place.—CANON 15.

Therefore any *change of place*, and consequent adoption of a *Litany-Stool*, must be dependent upon the sanction of the Ordinary. But we will now refer to the '*Injunctions*' upon which so much stress is laid in this especial matter.

In 1547, it was appointed in the *Injunctions* of Edward VI:—'Immediately before High-Mass, the Priests with other of the Quire shall kneel in the midst of the Church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the LITANY,...and in Cathedral or Collegiate Churches, the same shall be done in such places as our Commissaries in our Visitation shall appoint.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 15; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 8, 9.

ABP. CRANMER, in the same year, inquires in his Visitation Articles:—'Whether they...have said or sung the said LITANY in any other place but upon their knees in the midst of their Church?'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 46; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 29.

Now, in 1549 appeared the *First LITURGY* of Edward VI, in the *Rubrics* of which, the Minister is

directed to the Injunctions for the manner of saying the LITANY; and there is also a distinct allusion made to some specific place. In the *Rubric* preceding the LITANY in that Service Book, we read:—

*‘Upon Wednesdays and Fridays the English Litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by the King’s Majesty’s Injunctions,’* &c. (1549)—KEELING. 41, 229.

The *Rubric* at the beginning of the ‘COMMUNION-SERVICE’ in the same Book reads:—

*‘After Mattins ended (‘Morning Prayer.’ 1552-1662).... the English LITANY shall be said after the accustomed manner.’* 1549-1604. (‘the LITANY ended according to the accustomed manner.’ 1662)—KEELING 346-7.

In the same Office, however, the RUBRIC before *Psalm li.* enjoins—

*‘Then &c....And the Priest and Clerks kneeling (in the place’ 1662) [where they are accustomed to say the LITANY] shall say’* &c. (1549-1662)—KEELING 352-3.

This RUBRIC will be found in all the *five* LITURGIES (from 1549 to 1662), and it clearly implies some distinctive place; which, must, doubtlessly, be interpreted according to the usage prevailing in each particular Church; and *this place* with us is commonly the *Reading Desk*. Again—

In 1559. The above Injunction of EDWARD VI is given almost *verbatim* among the *Injunctions* of ELIZABETH, thus:—

*‘Immediately before the time of Communion of the Sacrament, the Priests with other of the Quire shall kneel in the midst of the Church,\* and sing or say plainly and distinctly the LITANY.... And in Cathedral or Collegiate Churches the same shall be done in such places, and in such sort, as our Commissioners in our Visitation shall appoint.’*—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 187; SPARROW’S *Coll.* 72.

In 1603-4 appeared the CANONS, which are still binding on the Clergy, the one bearing on this subject, CANON. 15, has been already cited.

\* Many subsequent writers in quoting this authority, insert after the word ‘Church’, this passage:—“at a low Desk before the Chancel Door

In 1641. Among the Charges brought against the London Divines before the Committee of the House of Lords, was the one following:—‘Reading the LITANY in the midst of the body of the Church, & in many of the Parochial Churches.’—CARDWELL’s *Clay*, 273.

The above evidences, it cannot but have been remarked, make no mention of the *Litany-Desk*, still it may be inferentially supposed that there was some piece of Church Furniture, some *Desk*, or *Stool*, at which the Priest was ‘to kneel.’ This is confirmed by the opinions following.

BP. ANDREWES *ib.* 1685, commenting upon the Rubric before the LITANY, says:—‘The Litany to be said or sung in the midst of the Church. *Injunct. Edit.* The Priest goeth from out of his seat into the body of the Church, and at a low *Desk* before the Chancel-door, called the *Fald-stool*, kneels, and says or sings the Litany.’—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL’S Com. Pr.* p. 23.

L’ESTRANGE *cir.* 1658 states:—‘The accustomed place was the midst of the Church, and the accustomed posture was kneeling, for so it was appointed in the Queen’s Injunctions. *Inj.* 15. and in those of Edward VI. *Inj.* 23.’—*Alliance of Div. Off.* p. 148.

BP. COSINS *ib.* 1671, in his observations upon the Prayer Book at the period of the *last Revision* 1662, when remarking upon the time when the LITANY was to be used, states:—‘Nor is the place of the Church here specified where it shall be said: though in the Rubric before the COMMUNION it is presumed that a peculiar place is appointed for it: and in Queen ELIZABETH’s Injunctions, that appointed place is said to be in the midst of the Choir,\* as in the Cathedral, and many other Churches, has been accustomed.’—*Add. Notes to NICHOLL’S Com. Pr.* p. 68.

BP. SPARROW *ib.* 1685, explaining where they are accustomed to say the Litany as directed by the Rubric in the COMMUNION-SERVICE, adds:—‘And that was in the Church before

*anciently called the Fald Stool.*” BP ANDREWES uses these words, and they will be found also on the frontispiece to an old edition of SPARROW’S *Rationales*: but not as a part of these Injunctions; yet they are quoted as belonging to these Injunctions by WHEATLEY, who is followed by the Rev. J. Jebb; W. GILSON HUMPHREY; Mr. A. J. STEPHENS, the ‘*Instrumenta Ecclesiastica*,’ and many others. The Editor of these papers however has not been able to discover either in his copy of SPARROW’S *Collection*, (Edis. 1684, black letter), in CARDWELL’S *Dec. Annals*, or in the numerous other works he has consulted, that these words form any portion of the Injunctions of Edward VI, or of Elizabeth.

\* The ‘Injunction’ is not so worded. See *supra* page 672.

'the Chancel-Door. *Eliz. Inj.* 18. And Bp. *Andrewes* in his 'Notes upon the Liturgy says:—"It being a Penitential Office is appointed to be said *there* in imitation of God's command to the 'priests in their penitential Service. *Joel* ii. 17. "*Let the Priests weep between the porch and the Altar.*" (p. 157.)—*Rationale*. ED. 1722. The *frontispiece* to the EDITION of 1655 has this explanatory passage:—"The Priest goeth forth from out of his 'seat into the body of the Church, and at a *low desk* before the 'Chancel door, called the *Fald-stool*, kneels, and says or sings the 'LITANY.' This has been assigned to Bp. *Andrewes*. (See *supra*.)

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742), after elucidating the term *Litany*, says:—"Such was that *Litany* of God's appointment in *Joel* (ii. 17), where, 'in a general assembly, the Priests were to *weep between the Porch and the Altar*, and to say, *Spare thy people, O Lord*: (in allusion to which place, our *Litany*, retaining also the same words, is 'enjoined, by the Royal Injunctions still in force' (of EDW. VI. and ELIZ. *above given*) 'to be said or sung in the *midst* of the Church, 'at a *low desk* before the Chancel door, anciently called the *Fald-stool*.\* (In a Note he refers to the remarks of BP. ANDREWES quoted above p. 673).—*Rat. Ill. of Book of C. Pr.* p. 161.

Modern authors, who write on this subject, are but few: the following are such as convey any practical information.

The REV. W. HEWETT observes:—"A distinct place for saying 'the LITANY is also conformable to ancient custom, and the requirements of our present Rubric. Thus, of the "Commination," 'part is directed to be said...."in the place where" "the Priests "and Clerks" "are accustomed to say the Litany." This place is 'the *Fald-stool*, a *low desk* without the Chancel, so turned that they 'who kneel at it face the east." (p. 8).—*Arrang. of Par. Churches*.

DR. HOOK, explaining *Fald-stool*, writes:—"A small *Desk* at 'which the LITANY is enjoined to be sung or said. It is generally 'placed in those Churches in which it is used, *in the middle of the 'Choir*, sometimes near the steps of the Altar. This word is probably derived from the barbarous Latin, *jalda*, a place shut up, a 'fold.'—*Church Dict.* 6th. ed.

The REV. J. JEBB, speaking of a distinct place for the performance of the LITANY being intimated in the Rubric of the COMMUNION-SERVICE, adds:—"This intimation is borne out by 'the Injunctions of the Sovereign at different times, the testimony 'of Ritualists, and the practice of the Church.' (After quoting the *Injunctions* of EDW. VI. and of ELIZ. and the remark of BP. ANDREWES, he proceeds). . . . 'Playford's Book records that "upon "the usual days that the *Litany* is appointed to be sung, it is sung

---

\* The '*low-desk*' is not mentioned in the *Injunctions* referred to; WHEATLY derives this from BP. ANDREWES. See Note *supra*. p. 672.

"by two of the Choir in the middle of the Church near the Bible Desk," as now at St Paul's. As to the practice of the Church... when originally performed at St Paul's, it was sung between the Choir and the Altar; *i. e.* exactly in the same place as at present, at the eastern end of the Stalls, at the commencement of the Presbytery. This was in accordance with the ancient practice of the English Church, since the Sarum Processional directs it to be said in the midst of the Choir: and the Roman, on Rogation Days, before the Altar. It is still performed at the Cathedrals of St Paul, and Lichfield, at Magdalen College, and perhaps elsewhere, at the extremity of the Stalls... At Caunterbury, York, Lincoln, and Oxford, the 'Fald-stool' is placed nearer the western door, but in all cases in the midst of the Choir, facing eastward. Exeter Cathedral and New College, and possibly other places, retain the 'Fald-stool.' That it was more commonly used formerly, is inferred from the well known frontispiece to SPARROW'S *Rationale*, which evidently represents a Parish Church. Whether it ought to be near the Altar, or in the midst of the Congregation, has been a matter of dispute. Our Cathedrals sanction both positions: and this is a question for the Ordinary to decide, as shall best conduce to edification. It is placed eastward of the Lectern at St Paul's, which seems a better position than that of Lincoln, where the 'Leotern' is near the Altar, and faces the 'Fald-stool.' The 'Fald-stool,' according to the best precedents, ought to be a low Desk, merely high enough to kneel at: not like the Eagle at Canterbury, which is improperly used for the LITANY, contrary to all Choral precedent in England.' (p. 434-6.) When speaking of the "COMMUNION-SERVICE" the author says:—The latter parts are to be said at the Fald-stool, or place where the LITANY is customarily said.' (p. 533)—*Chor. Service.*

THE REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, after commenting upon the several *Injunctions* of Edward, and of Elizabeth, and a few other evidences, adds:—'On a consideration of the whole history, however, it appears that the authority is not of any great cogency; more especially as the last Revisers of the Prayer-Book refused to declare themselves expressly against the general custom by inserting in the Rubric the direction of the forgotten *Injunctions*. I do not, therefore, believe that we are bound in conscience to revive the earlier practice: and to do so in Parish Churches, where it has fallen into disuse, would at this time be a measure of very questionable wisdom.' (p. 151).—*How shall we Conform to the Liturgy.*

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) writes:—'The Churchwardens ought also, in strictness, to provide a low Desk, anciently called the *Fald-stool*, to be placed in the midst of the Church before the Chancel door, at which the Litany is to be said or sung.' (p. 44).—*Churchwardens' Guide.*

THE GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE, describing the *Fald-stool*, states:—'This term is frequently, but erroneously, applied to the *Litany-stool*, or small low desk at which the LITANY is enjoined to be sung or said. This is generally placed in the middle of the choir, sometimes near the steps of the Altar, as in Magdalen College Chapel, sometimes near the west end, as in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.' (p. 160)—4th Edit.

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA, describing *Litany-Desks*, says:—‘These are low moveable *Desks*, to be placed, when wanted, ‘at the eastern end of the Nave, outside the entrance to the Chancel. They ought to be covered with a hanging or embroidered Carpet, which may either quite envelope them, or merely cover the Book-stand, or depend in front. Where expert carvers cannot be had, the plain poppy head ought to be chosen.’—*Plate*. 17. (and 23.) In a *Note* it is erroneously stated, that—‘They are distinctly ordered in the *Injunction* of Queen Elizabeth. xviii. ‘A. D. 1559.’ (See *supra* p. 672).

The QUARTERLY REVIEW, animadverting upon ‘worshipping towards the East,’ refers to the Frontispiece of SPARROW’s *Rationale*, as not making for that practice, but as explaining the usage of performing the LITANY:—‘It represents a large and handsome Church with Nave and Aisles, but without any Pews, Seats, or divisions whatsoever—no precedent, therefore, for our present Churches. The Priest is on his knees in the body of the Church at a low Desk at the foot of the Chancel steps, and looking towards the East; around and behind him the centre of the Nave is clear, the Congregation is ranged on their knees, in two rows—one on each hand—the heads of the rows one a little nearer the Chancel steps, and the other a little further back than the Minister’s Desk:—out of the Minister’s mouth is a little lable with “Spare thy people, O Lord!”—and certainly the whole is arranged very orderly, and it looks as if the Congregation could with great convenience follow their Minister. But it turns out that this is not the ordinary performance of Divine Service, for under this scene is the following explanatory legend:—“*The Litany is to, &c.*” (given under BPS. SPARROW, and ANDREWES, *supra*). So, then, this authority for worshipping to the East turns out to be an exceptional proceeding confined to the LITANY; which we have ourselves seen practised in Cathedrals. . . . He (the Minister) is directed to go from out of his seat and to kneel at this stool; and so far from being at all separated or secluded from the people, he goes into the body of the Church, and from the middle of his Congregation, ranged in two rows by his side, he puts up their common supplications.’ (p. 280).—No. cxliii. May 1843.

## Monuments, Gravestones,

### Memorial Tablets, &c.

Although *Monuments*, and *Gravestones*, &c., are not “Ornaments of the Church” in the Ecclesiastical sense of that expression, yet they are usually classed among them, from their supposed decorative character, and from being fixedly attached to the freehold of the Church and Churchyard. The subject is one of much importance on account of the

very doubtful nature, in point of law, of the right claimed by an INCUMBENT of granting or withholding his consent to the erection of *Monuments*, &c.; and of demanding the payment of certain *Fees*, as well in acknowledgment of such right, as in recompence to him for the space, or *quid pro quo*, surrendered. Besides which, in all matters of a pecuniary nature, more especially when such transactions are between a Pastor and one or other of his flock, it is highly essential that the claim set up be recognized as lawful, and the charge made be acknowledged to be reasonable and customary. Moreover, it is likewise of consequence that it should be generally known in whom rests the legal ownership of *Monuments*, *Gravestones*, &c. when once erected in a Church or Churchyard; as well as upon whom devolves the duty of keeping them in repair. The great arbiter in most disputes that may arise with respect to '*Fees*' is *custom*; but for the prevention of doubts and difficulties with regard either to the admission, or the erection of *Monuments*, &c., a '*Faculty*' from the Ordinary seems to be the most efficient means.

These several points we shall now proceed to discuss; and with the view of making our observations more easy of reference, we will depart from their logical order, and adopt an *Alphabetical* arrangement. At the conclusion, we will offer a few remarks on the style and character of these Memorials of the Dead, adding such Ecclesiastical opinions as may afford additional elucidation. It will be necessary, however, that we first advert to the two great questions of (1) the *Legality* of Monuments &c.; and (2) of the *Permission* requisite for their erection.

I. Their *Legality*.—It may be stated, on the authority of LORD COKE, that the erection of *Monuments*, and *Tombs*, and the setting up of *Grave-Stones*, in the CHURCH, or CHURCHYARD; and the fixing of *Memorial Tablets* against the walls of the fabric, are not only permissible, but *lawful*.

LORD COKE says:—‘Concerning the building or erecting of *Tombs, Sepulchres, or Monuments* for the deceased, in Church, Chancel, common Chapel, or Churchyard, in convenient manner, *it is lawful*; for it is the last work of charity that can be done for the Deceased, who whilst he lived was a lively temple of the Holy Ghost, with a reverend regard, and Christian hope of a joyful resurrection (3 *Inst.* 102.)... But the building or erecting of the *Sepulchre, Tomb, or other Monument*, ought not to be to the hindrance of the celebration of Divine Service.’ (3 *Inst.* 202.)—BURN’S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 271. a; CRIPP’S *Laws Rel. to Ch.* & *Cl.* 422; ROGER’S *Eccl. L.* 156; DR. HOOK’S *Ch. Dict.* p. 453.

II. The *Permission* requisite.—It is laid down as a general rule, that *no Monument* can be set up *without the consent of the ORDINARY*, and that the INCUMBENT’S *sanction*, although held to be sufficient by customary usage, yet is merely *representative* of the permission of the ORDINARY; and that the latter possesses the *power*, not only to over-rule the authority of the INCUMBENT in this respect, but even to set it completely aside. We are speaking here simply of the *power*: it is a very unusual thing for the Ordinary to adopt any measures in this particular which may be opposed to the reasonable arrangements of the Incumbent; and it is likewise very rare that the Ecclesiastical Courts will interpose. Still, in the case of *large structures, buildings of height*, and *Tablets* affixed to the Fabric of the Church, the consent of the ORDINARY is indispensable. The INCUMBENT’S permission is only allowed—and that tacitly—to be sufficient in the minor cases of *flat Gravestones, Head and Foot Stones*, or the like. In a contested case, however, the consent of the Incumbent without the sanction of the Ordinary also will be of little avail. This we shall find confirmed in the following decisions.

LORD STOWELL (Sir Wm. Scott) observes:—‘As to *buildings of height*, the authority is reserved to the ORDINARY, and permission ought not to be granted without his authority in some manner interposed. The proper mode, strictly speaking, is to apply to the ORDINARY for a *Faculty*, who calls on all persons having a right to shew cause why it should not be done, and hears and determines on the force of any objections that may be made against it. The Third Institute leaves the matter at large, but all commentators say that the ORDINARY is to judge of the convenience of allowing *Tombs, or Monuments* to be erected,



'and that if done without his consent, he has sufficient authority to decree a removal.... There is a difference between a *Flat Stone*, and that of a *building of greater height*.' (*Bardin v. Calcott*, 1 Consist. R. 145.)—The same learned judge also laid it down in another case, that:—'The permission of the ORDINARY is necessary before any Monument can properly be erected. It is to his care that the Fabric of the Church is committed, that it shall not be injured or deformed by the caprice of individuals. The consent of the INCUMBENT is taken on such occasions, and especially of the RECTOR, for Monuments in the Chancel. A Faculty likewise is required, though it is frequently omitted, under the confidence reposed in the Minister, and the Ecclesiastical Court is not eager to interpose; but when cases are brought before it, it is necessary to inquire, whether the thing is proper to be done, and whether the consent of the INCUMBENT has been obtained.' (*Maidman v. Malpas*, 1 Consist. R. 208.)—BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 273; *Rogers' Eccl. L.* 517; *SIMPSON'S Cl. Man.* 186; *STEPHEN'S Laws Rel. to Ch.* 211; *WADDILOVE'S Dig. of Ecc. Cases.* 249.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) says on this point:—'The ORDINARY is the sole and proper judge of what may be erected in the interior of the Church; and in the setting up of Monuments it is essential that his consent should be obtained. (After referring to the judgment of LORD STOWELL, given above, he adds;—).... It is also stated in the books, that the consent of the PARSON is necessary to the erection of Monuments in the Church. This, however, must be considered as very doubtful; nor is it to be collected from any decision that if the ORDINARY were to grant permission to erect a Monument in the Church, the dissent of the INCUMBENT would be material. (*p.* 422).... But the strongest dictum in favour of the right of the INCUMBENT is that of LORD STOWELL (in *Maidman v. Malpas*, *supra*). "The Court," he says, "would act improperly, if it was to say, that parties might erect a Monument without leave of the RECTOR." But in this case, it appears from the Report, that the Monument was intended to be erected in the Chancel; and it does not appear that the consent of the ORDINARY had been obtained. Upon the whole, it appears, that if the ORDINARY should grant a Licence for the erecting of any Monument in the Church, the INCUMBENT would have no power to prevent this from being done. It is true that the freehold of the Parson would be thus invaded; but for this the customary Fees would be compensation.... Usually the consent of the INCUMBENT has been held to be essential, as representing the ORDINARY for this purpose; for practically it is certain, that the consent of the ORDINARY to the erection of Monuments is seldom obtained, and the consent of the RECTOR is obtained instead; for "the ORDINARY usually reposes confidence in the Minister to do what is proper," (*LORD STOWELL, supra*), and the cases must be rare in which a 'Faculty' would be granted in opposition to the wishes of the INCUMBENT. But nothing can legalize the erection of a Monument without a Faculty obtained for that purpose; so that the assent of the PARSON, though generally deemed sufficient, would be of no avail if the matter were contested.' (1 Consist. 14, 208; 3 Add. 15; *Hopper v. Davis*. *Lee* 640. See also *Cart. v. Marsh*. 1 Str. 1080; *Palmer v. Bp. of*

*Exeter. ib.* 576.)—*Laws Rel. to Ch. & Cl.* p. 423.... With regard to *Grave-Stones &c.* in CHURCHYARDS, the same author observes:—‘That which we have before said... ..as to the respective rights of the RECTOR and the ORDINARY in such cases, would, it is conceived, be equally applicable to the case of *Monuments* or *Tombstones* in the CHURCHYARD. Unfortunately in a recent case (*Brecks v. Woolfrey*, 1 Curt. 880) in which the question came to be directly decided, whether a party might erect a *Tombstone* without the consent of the INCUMBENT, the point was held to have been not sufficiently put in issue by the terms of the citation; and the Court gave no intimation of its opinion. It rather appears, however, that, as was said before in the case of the erection of *Monuments* in the Church, the INCUMBENT practically may be considered as representing the ORDINARY for this purpose, “the ORDINARY reposing confidence in him to do what is proper;” but that it is in this manner only that the consent of the Incumbent can be considered as absolutely necessary; and that, in strictness of law, it is the ORDINARY whose consent is essential, and that he might give or withhold his consent without reference to the consent of the INCUMBENT. Or it may perhaps he said, further, (though practically it would be the same thing), that the INCUMBENT has the power of consent or dissent as against every one except the ORDINARY, but it must be remembered that the exact point has not been directly decided.’—(*ib.* p. 432.)—See also WADDILOVE’S *Digest*. p. 249.

MR. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*) states;—‘The permission of the ORDINARY is necessary before any *Monument* can be erected in the Chantry, or *Tombstone* in the CHURCHYARD. (p. 156).... It is a custom in most Parishes to allow a *Flat-Stone*, or an upright *Head-Stone* to be erected; in some a *Fee* is demanded for the permission, and in some not, and when such custom exists, permission may continue to be given without, it would seem, application to the ORDINARY for a *Faculty*. (*Bardin v. Calcot*. 1 Hag. Cons. 14, 18; *Sharpe v. Hansard*: 3 Hagg. 337.). But where any thing is required to be done, not sanctioned by usage, as the erection of a *Monument* of any height, the authority to grant permission for its erection is reserved for the ORDINARY, who calls on all persons having a right to shew cause why it should not be done, and hears and determines the objection to be made against it. (*ib.* *Seager v. Bowle*, 1 Add. 541).’ (p. 263). This author also observes:—‘If not conveniently (*inconveniently?*) placed the PARSON’S authority to erect a *Monument* or *Tablet* would, generally speaking, be sufficient. (*Hopper v. Davis*. 1 Lee 640; *GIBS. Cod.* 454.)’—*Ecc. L.* p. 518.

We will now proceed to eliminate this important subject, and should any additional information be required, the Reader is referred to the legal authorities whose names will be found annexed to each sub-division.

**Alterations.**—No alterations with respect to *Monuments, &c.* in a Church or Churchyard can be legally effected without a ‘*Faculty*.’

In *Sharps v. Hansard*, the majority of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled, with the view of improving and gaining space in the Churchyard; and having the consent of the INCUMBENT; prayed for a Faculty to enable them to lay flat the upright Head and Foot-stones. The petition was opposed by a Parishioner who had set up an upright Gravestone to the memory of his wife and three children, and had paid a 'Fee' for its erection. The Court notwithstanding granted the 'Faculty,' but it was on the condition that no expence should fall on individuals. (3 Hagg. 335.)—ROGERS 263, 516; STEPHENS 212, 365; WADDILOVE 119, 189; SIMPSON'S *Cl. Man.* 186.

*Appeals.*—The ORDINARY in the exercise of his power with respect to giving or withholding his sanction for the erection of *Monuments, &c.* must regulate his proceedings according to 'a prudent and legal discretion:' and although he is held to be the proper judge in such matters, yet an *Appeal* will lie to the METROPOLITAN, who may reverse the ORDINARY'S decision. (*Cart v. Marsh*, 2 Str. 575, 1080.) Moreover, the party cannot waive the *Appeal*, and apply to the Court of Q. Bench for a *prohibition* instead. (*Bulwer v. Hase*, 3 East. 217.)—BURN i. 372; CRIPPS 423; *Steer's Par. Law*. Clive. 36; STEPHENS 212.

*Brasses.*—See *infra*.

*Churchwardens' Consent.*—The sanction of the *Churchwardens* to set up a Monument, &c. without the permission of the Incumbent, and the Ordinary, is *illegal*. In *Beckwith* (Clerk) v. *Harding*, 1818, the Churchwardens had claimed the right to set up *Monuments* without the consent of either the Rector or the Ordinary; LORD ELLENBOROUGH decided:—'Assuming that the custom for *Churchwardens* to set up *Monuments* in the Church without the consent of the Parson might be good; it is at any rate too large a proposition to contend for that without the consent of the Rector, or that of their common Ecclesiastical superior, they may put up any thing, however unseemly.' (1 B. & A. 508.)—CRIPPS. 423; ROGERS. 156; STEER. 36; C. G. PRIDEAUX. *Chm. Guide*. 269. Mr. STEPHENS says; that *Churchwardens* doing so, 'would, in effect, secularize the Church: but if the custom claimed be for the Churchwardens to set up *Monuments with the leave* of the ORDINARY only, the case may, perhaps, be different.'—*L. Rel. to Cl.* p. 212.

*Churchwardens* cannot give permission to erect a *Gravestone* without the leave of the Ordinary, except by custom. (*Bardin v. Calcot*. 1 Hagg. Con. 14; Str. 1080.). Nor indeed without the consent of the Parson also, especially in the Church. (*Maidman v. Malpas*. 1 Hagg. Con. 211; 3 Inst. 217).—ROGERS 156.

*Churchwardens*, or other persons, giving orders to remove a *Monument*, or a *Body*, without a 'Faculty,' are liable to an action in the Ecclesiastical Court. (*Hutchins v. Denziloe*, 1 Hagg. Con. 172.)—STEPHENS. 212; WADDILOVE 119; SIMPSON'S *Cl. Man.* 186.

*Churchwardens* may bring actions for *defacing* *Monuments*, as was decided in *Bishop v. Turner*. (Godh. 279.).

*Cemeteries.*—Monuments, &c. in *Cemeteries* are regulated by 10 & 11 *Vict. c. 65*. In which it is enacted—

As to the *ERECTION*, that:—‘The Company may....sell the right of placing any *Monument* or *Gravestone* in the Cemetery, or any *Tablet* or *Monumental Inscription* on the walls of any Chapel or other building within the Cemetery.’—*Sect. 40*.

As to the *RIGHT*—‘The grant of the exclusive right....in any part of the Cemetery....of placing therein any *Monument*, *Tablet*, or *Gravestone*, may be made in the Form in the Schedule to this Act annexed,\* or to the like effect, and where the Company are not incorporated, it may be executed by the Company, or any two or more of them.’—*Sect. 42*.

As to *PROHIBITIONS*:—‘No such grant as aforesaid shall give the right....to place any *Monument*, *Gravestone*, *Tablet*, or *Monumental Inscription* respecting any such Body,’ (not entitled to be buried in consecrated ground according to the Rites and usages of the Established Church), ‘within the consecrated part of the Cemetery.’—*Sect. 49*.

As to *REMOVAL*:—‘The Company may take down and remove any *Gravestone*, *Monument*, *Tablet*, or *Monumental Inscription*, which shall have been placed within the Cemetery, without their authority.’—*Sect. 50*.

As to the *BISHOP of the Diocese*:—‘The *BISHOP of the Diocese* in which the Cemetery is situated, and all persons acting under authority, shall have the same right and power to object to the placing, and to procure the removal of any *Monumental Inscription* within the consecrated part of the Cemetery, as he by law has to object to or procure the *REMOVAL* of any *Monumental Inscription* in any Church or Chapel of the Established Church, or the Burial Ground belonging to such Church or Chapel, or any other consecrated Ground.’—*Sect. 51*.

As to *DAMAGE*:—‘Every person who shall....wilfully destroy, injure, or deface any *Monument*, *Tablet*, *Inscription*, or *Gravestone* within the Cemetery, or do any other wilful damage therein, shall forfeit to the Company for every such offence a sum not exceeding £5.’—*Sect. 58*.

\* The *Form* is this:—

‘By virtue of (*here name the Act*) We (*here state the name of the Company*), in consideration of the sum of — to us paid by — of — do hereby grant unto the said — the exclusive right of placing a *MONUMENT*, (*Tablet*, or *Gravestone*) in (*here describe the place*), to hold the same to the said — in perpetuity (*or, as the case may be*) for the purpose of placing a *MONUMENT*, (*Tablet*, or *Gravestone*).

‘Given under our Common Seal (*or*, under our Hands and Seals, as the case may be) this — day of — in the year of our Lord, —.

*Custom.*—Immemorial *custom* has the force of law with respect to *Fees*, but not against a *Faculty*. LORD STOWELL says:—‘Ancient *custom* often annexes *Fees* for erecting a *Stone*, or any thing else, by which the *Grave* may be protected, and the memory of the person interred, preserved. It is no general Common Law right; but *custom* will interpose, and where it is shown to be customary, such practice will be supported.’—BURN I. 271; SIMPSON 186.

‘The practice of *twenty years*, though continuous, cannot have the effect in Law of establishing the validity of any *Fees*. Time and usage are essential parts of a *Custom*, and therefore no *Custom* is allowable, but such as hath been used by *prescription*, i. e. time out of mind.’—BACON’S *Abridgement*, p. 232.

DR. ADDAMS states in a *Note* to the Report of the case of *Seager v. Bowle*, that:—‘The Court may be taken to have expressed its final judgment, that *no practice* can absolutely legalize the erection of a Monument without a “*Faculty*.” (1 Add. 554.).

*Defacing, and Injuring.*—Defacing *Monuments*, &c., is both an Ecclesiastical offence, and an offence at Common Law. The Churchwardens (*Godbolt*, 279.), or the party who set up the Monument, &c., and if they are dead, the heir of the deceased to whose memory the Monument, &c. was erected, can maintain an action against the offenders: but, it is said, it must be an *action of trespass*. Moreover, an action will not stand against the Incumbent, if the Monument was erected without a ‘*Faculty*.’ (Co. Litt. 18. h.; 3 Inst. 110.; *Wilson v. Mc Math*. 3 Phill. 89; 2 Roll. Rep. 140; *Spooner v. Brewster*. 3 Bing. 136; 10 B Moore. 454.)—CRIPPS. 424; ROGERS. 157. 518. n.; STEPHENS 214.

In the reigns of EDWARD VI. and of ELIZABETH, the popular zeal for the demolition of Monuments of idolatry, and feigned Images, led even to the destruction of the ‘*Memorials of the Dead*.’ The violence of the mob, however, was restrained by Act of Parliament in the time of EDWARD, and by Royal Proclamation in the time of ELIZABETH.

The Statute, 3 & 4 Edw. VI. c. 10; ordering the demolition of *Images*, has the following clause with respect to *Tombstones*, &c.:—‘Provided always, that this Act, or any thing therein contained, shall not extend to any *Image* or *Picture* set or graven upon any *Tomb* in any Church, Chapel, or Churchyard, only for a Monument of any King, prince, nobleman, or other dead person, which hath not been commonly reputed and taken for a Saint, but that such *Pictures*, and *Images*, may stand and continue.’—Sect. 6.

The *Proclamation* of ELIZABETH:—‘Commandeth all manner of persons hereafter to forbear the breaking or defacing of any parcel of any Monument, or Tomb, or Grave, or other Inscription, and Memory of any person deceased, being in any manner of place; or to break any image of Kings, Princes, or Nobles, estates of this realm, or of any other that have been in times past erected and set up for the only memory of them to their posterity, in common Churches, and not for any religious honour; or to break down and deface any image in *glass windows* in any Churches, without consent of the Ordinary upon pain... of fine and imprisonment.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 257.

*Monuments, and Tombstones, &c.* suffered very severely also during the intemperate triumph of the party of OLIVER CROMWELL; the evidences of which are painfully visible at the present day in many of our Cathedrals.

LORD COKE says on this subject:—‘The defacing of *Monuments* is punishable by the Common Law, as it appeareth in the Book of the 9 Edw. IV. c. 14. (the *Lady Wiche’s* case), and so it was agreed by the whole Court. M. 10. Jac. in the Common Pleas, between *Corven & Pym*. And for the *defacing* thereof, they that build or erect the same shall have the action during their lives. . . . and after their deceases, the heir of the Deceased shall have the action. (3 Inst. 202.) . . . And if a Nobleman, Knight, Esquire, or other, be buried in a Church, and have his *Coat-armour* and *Pennions* with his arms, and such other *Ensigns* of honour as belong to his degree or order, set up in the Church, or if a *Grave-stone*, or *Tomb*, be laid or made for a Monument of him, in this case, although the freehold of the Church be in the Parson, and that these be annexed to the freehold, yet cannot the Parson, or any other, *take* them or *deface* them, but he is subject to an action to the heir and his heirs in the honour and memory of whose ancestor they were set up. (1 Inst. 18.)—DR. WATSON says, ‘This is to be understood of such *Monuments* only as are set up in the Aisles belonging to particular persons, or if they are set up in any other part of the Church, he supposeth it to be understood that they were placed there with the Incumbent’s consent.’ (c. 39.)—DR. GIBSON observing thereupon, saith thus:—“*Monuments, Coat-armour, and other Ensigns* of honour, set up in memory of the deceased, may not be removed at the pleasure of the ORDINARY, or INCUMBENT. On the contrary, if either they, or any other person, shall take away or deface them, the person who set them up, shall have an action against them during his life, and after his death the heir of the Deceased shall have the same, who (as they say) is inheritable to arms and the like, as to heir-looms; and it avails not, that they are annexed to the freehold, though that is in the Parson.” (*Cod.* 453, 454.) . . . (See further “*Removing*” postea).—BURN’S *Eccl. L.* Phil. i. 272; abbreviated in CRIPPS’ 424; ROGERS’ 156; STEER’S 37; STEPHEN’S 211, 214; HOOK’S *Church Dict.* p. 453.

DR. BURN adds:—‘M. 10. Geo. SIR THOMAS BURY set up his *Arms* in the Church of St David’s, Exeter. The Ordinary promotes a suit in the Spiritual Court to *deface* them, as being set up without his consent. It was moved for a prohibition, on the authorities that action lies by the heir for defacing the Monument of his ancestor; but EYRE, and FORTESCUE, *Justices*, said, the Ordinary was judge what Ornaments were proper, and might order them to be *defaced*. The same was afterwards moved in the Court of Common Pleas, and denied there also. (*Palmer v. Bp. of Exeter*. Stra. 576.)’—*Eccl. L.* Phil. i. 372.

*Chief Justice BEST* decided, in *Spooner v. Brewster*, that:—‘The possession and right of property in *Tombstones* erected in a Churchyard, like the *Monuments* in the Church, belong to those who erected them; and if any one *defaces* or *injures* them, the owners may have an action against the wrong-doer. (2 C. & P. 14.). But if the Incumbent, in exercise of his general discretion and authority over the whole freehold of the Church, *injures* them,

or causes them to be *removed*, it seems that no remedy lies against him, unless the erection was made under the sanction of a "Faculty." (*Bryan v. Whistler*. 8. B. & C. 288.).—CRIPPS 433; STEER 49; see also STEPHENS 213.

*Damaging by Cattle.*—'If a Minister turn *Horses* or *Cattle* in the Churchyard to graze, by which means the *Graves* are trampled on, or *defaced*, and the *Tombstones*, or *Trees* injured, the Ordinary might most properly interfere to order their removal; as in the case of unseemly Monuments erected within the Church. Or the Minister might be libelled in the Ecclesiastical Court at the suit of the Churchwardens for *Nuisance* in the Churchyard.'—CRIPPS. 429.

*Divine Service* not to be impeded.—'The building or erecting of Sepulchres, Tombs, or other Monuments, ought not to be an incumbrance, or annoyance to the Church, or any way *hindering* or incommoding either the Minister in performing any of the Divine Offices, or the Parishioners in partaking of them. In this case the Ordinary has the power to give directions for their removal, and the Churchwardens will be justified in the executing of those directions: for the original intent of the Church being the service of God Almighty, nothing is to be permitted there which shall be any way obstructive of it; and of what is so, or is not so, the Bishop is the sole judge: and therefore no one can be safe in any new erection there who has not had the Bishop's licence for the same, especially in setting up Altar-Monuments, which mostly in the end are a nuisance and incumbrance to the Church, wherever they are placed.' (3 Inst. 202; 3 Bing. 136; 10 Moo. 484).—BURN. i. 272, 372; PRIDEAUX *Chw. Guide*. 268.

*Epitaphs.*—See *infra*.

*Faculty Necessary.*—No Monuments &c. can be legally erected in any CHURCH or CHURCHYARD without permission of the ORDINARY, and this is conferred by "*Faculty*." Because, as LORD STOWELL says:—"It is to his care that the "Fabric of the Church is committed, that it shall not be injured or "deformed by the caprice of individuals." (*Maidman v. Malpas* 1 Cons. R. 208.) In the same case it was decided, that a Monument *once erected* cannot be *taken down*, or *defaced*, without a 'Faculty.'—BURN i. 273; STEPHENS 211.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH—in the Court of King's Bench in *Bulwer v. Hase*, 1803, where the Rector of a Parish applied for a prohibition to restrain the ORDINARY from granting a Faculty to a party for *stopping up a Window* in the Church, against which it was proposed to erect a Monument,—held the application of the Incumbent to be premature, so that it was not decided on its merits; but, said the Judge, 'the *Faculty* sought to be obtained was no 'more than a Licence from the Ordinary himself to do the act 'proposed, and would not bind the Rector against his consent, 'if by law his consent were material; and non constat, that after

'his consent were obtained, the defendant would make use of it, 'without obtaining the consent of the Rector also.' It was decided to be no ground for a *prohibition*, but mere matter of *appeal*. (3 East. 217.)—BURN l. 273. a; ROGERS 520; STEPHENS 212.

MR. ROGERS states that:—'In order to have a *Monument* erected in the Church, the course is to apply to the ORDINARY for a 'Faculty;' for he is to judge of the convenience of allowing Tombs or Monuments to be erected....The *consent of the Incumbent* alone is frequently acted upon on such occasions, and especially of the Rector for Monuments in the Chancel; and a 'Faculty' is frequently omitted under the confidence reposed in the Minister. (*Maidman v. Malpas*. 1 Hagg. Con. 208; *Bardin v. Calcot*. ib. 14; *Hopper v. Davis*. 2 Lee. 640.). With regard to buildings of height, the authority is *wholly reserved to the Ordinary*, and permission ought not to be granted without his authority in some manner interposed. (1 Hagg. Con. 14.).... The erecting *Tombstones* in the CHURCHYARD without a *Faculty* may be punished in the Ecclesiastical Court, and the party obliged by a decree of that Court to remove them.' (ib.)—EccL. L. 517; STEER 36. 48.

In *Seager v. Bowle*,—(A criminal proceeding against a Parishioner for erecting a Monument in a Church *without a Faculty*, and to shew cause why it should not be removed;)—Notwithstanding the defendant had obtained the consent of the Minister and Churchwardens, the Court of Delegates, on appeal, reversed the decision of a peculiar jurisdiction, and admitted the allegation, thereby deciding that *no practice can legalize the erection of a Monument without a Faculty*. (1 Add. 541, 544. n.)—ROGERS 520; STEER 36; WADDILOVE 189, 249; CHR. REMEMBRANCER. October 1833.

Still, the Court of Delegates maintained (in *Hopper v. Davis*). that where a Monument had been set up with the Parson's consent, it was sufficient; for although the Ordinary might interpose, yet if he did not interpose, the *Parson's consent was enough*. (1 Lee. 648)—WADDILOVE 249.

The *cost* of a Faculty in this Diocese (*Ely*) is about £16.: one and the same 'Form' being usually employed, it is immaterial whether it be for a *Monument*, *Tomb*, *Tablet*, &c. or an *Organ*. Still, the possession of a 'Faculty' for erecting a *Monument*, *Gravestone*, &c. will not set aside the claim of the Incumbent for his *customary Fees*.

*Fees*.—The generality of writers on Ecclesiastical Law allow, that the INCUMBENT may demand a 'Fee' for the erection of a Monument, Gravestone, &c.; but it should be such as has been accustomed to be paid where a custom prevails; and if there has been no custom, it is said that he may prescribe his own reasonable terms. He should take care that no *Monument*, *Gravestone*, &c. be erected till the *Fees* are paid, otherwise he has but an expensive remedy. The *Churchwardens*, *Sexton*, or other



person, entrusted with the care and custody of the Church and Churchyard, should be instructed never to allow a *Grave-Stone* &c. to be admitted, or removed, or the *soil* of the Churchyard in any way to be disturbed, without the authority of the Incumbent, (or his representative, if *non-resident*) expressed in *writing*, and which should be issued on every occasion. If the '*Fee*' be objected to, the Incumbent can refuse to admit the *Monument*, &c. The alternative is an *appeal* from the applicants to the Ordinary; but such a step is not likely to be resorted to on their part, since it would entail upon them the additional expence of a '*Faculty*' before their object could be obtained. The *non-payment* of the Incumbent's *Fees*, however, will not retard the granting of a '*Faculty*.' (See '*Custom*' *Supra*.)

DR. BURN is of opinion:—'Whether a *Fee* is due to the INCUMBENT for erecting a *Gravestone* or *Monument* in the CHURCHYARD hath been questioned by some, and no case hath occurred wherein the same hath received a judicial determination. It seemeth to be an argument in favour of the Incumbent, that although it is necessary to bury the dead, yet it is not necessary to erect *Monuments*; and after the soil hath been broken for interring the Dead, the grass will grow again, and continue beneficial to the Incumbent; but after the erection of a *Monument*, there ceaseth to be any further produce of the soil in that place. And if the Incumbent's leave is necessary for erecting a *Monument*, it seemeth that he may prescribe his own reasonable terms; or if an accustomed *Fee* hath been paid, that such custom ought to be observed.'—*Eccl. L. Phil. i. 272*; and quoted by STEER 49; STEPHENS 211.

MR. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*) is of opinion with respect to the *Fees* for Monuments and Gravestones, that—'The Incumbent is not entitled by any *general* law or custom to demand a *Fee* for their being made, or affixed, though it may be due to him by '*special* custom; but even if entitled, he cannot delay the grant of a '*Faculty*' till his *Fee* is paid, for such a grant would not preclude him from recovering his *Fees*, if legally entitled to them.' (*Rich v. Rushnell*. 4 Hagg. 154.).—*Eccl. L. 122*. See also *Bardin v. Calcut* 1 Hagg. Con. 14; *Littlewood v. Williams* 6 Taunt. 280.

*Recovery of Fees* due by custom, where this may be denied, or the amount disputed, is by Common Law; (GIBS. Cod. 542; 1 Salk. 334); or they may be sued for in the Ecclesiastical Court, as well as by an action at Law. (*Spry. v. Par. of St. Marylebone*. 2 Curt. 11; *Spry. v. Emperor*. 6 M. & W. 639.)—ROGERS 122; WADDILOVE 96.

DR. LUSHINGTON observes (in 1824): 'In the case of a *Tomb-stone* erected with permission of the Incumbent, and subsequent refusal of the *Fee*, it appears that no remedy remains but at Common Law; where the custom must be strictly proved.... The Incumbent should have insisted upon payment *before* he permitted the stone to be erected. Having permitted it, he cannot remove it.'—CHR. REMEMBRANCER April, June, 1834.

The *Sum charged*, as well as the appropriation of the amount, varies in different Parishes; being dependent in some cases upon the *special custom* of the place, in others upon local Acts, and in some upon the scale allowed by the Ordinary. To cite therefore any general '*Table of Fees*' illustrative of the Charges made in a city, town, or village, would be impossible: the following Scale, however, will convey some idea of the different *items*, and the *Fees* charged, in very many country Parishes. But in London these *Fees* are considerably higher.

	£	s	d
<i>Monument, or Tomb in the Chancel</i> .....about	21	0	0
<i>Tablet</i> ..... Ditto .. from 5 <i>Gs.</i> to	10	10	0
<i>Monument, or Tomb in the Church</i> ..... about	15	15	0
<i>Tablet</i> .....Ditto.....	5	5	0
<i>Monument, or Tomb in the Church-yard</i> .. about	10	10	0
<i>Tablet on the external walls of the Church</i> .....	3	3	0
<i>Tablet on the walls of the Church-yard</i> .....	2	2	0
<i>Coped Grave-Stone</i> .....	1	1	0
<i>Flat Grave-Stone</i> .....	0	10	6
<i>Head Stone</i> .....	0	10	6
<i>Foot Stone</i> .....	0	5	0
<i>Oak Memorial Beam (lengthwise)</i> .....	0	10	6
<i>Oak Head Memorial</i> .....	0	7	6
<i>Every Fresh Inscription on a Monument, or Tomb</i> ..... on a Head, or Flat Stone	1	1	0
<i>Every Fresh Initial Letter, or Date on a Foot</i> <i>Stone (each letter, or figure)</i> .....	0	0	6
<i>Iron, or Wooden Railings round a Monument,</i> <i>Tomb, Vault, or Grave</i> .....from 5 <i>Gs.</i> to	10	10	0

\*.\* NON-PARISHIONERS pay *double Fees*.

When *Fees* are not established, they are perpetually open to dispute: to avoid this unpleasantness it has been recommended, that the INCUMBENT, and *Parishioners* in Vestry assembled, should draw up a *Scale of Charges*, and present it to the PATRON and the ORDINARY for their approval. This *Scale*, if confirmed and attested by the signatures of the PATRON and ORDINARY, is held to be binding upon the Incumbent, and his Parishioners; and it should be hung up for general reference, either in the Vestry Room, or in some convenient place in the Church.

*Flat Stones, Coped Grave-Stones, Head, and Foot Stones, and Wooden Memorials*, are usually erected by permission of the Incumbent alone; and with this the Ordinary, by

general usage, is sufficiently satisfied; but when buildings of greater height are required, or when the Fabric of the Church is concerned, the ORDINARY will interpose. LORD STOWELL supposes there is "a difference in this respect between a *Flat-Stone* "and that of a building of greater height." (See page 678 *supra*). To secure therefore *legal protection* to Monuments, Tombs, Tablets, or other structures of the kind, a '*Faculty*' is indispensable: otherwise the ORDINARY may command the erection to be taken down, or the Incumbent proceed to alter its position, or curtail its dimensions. The Architect, Stone-Mason, and the workmen employed by them, should be warned not to exceed in one iota the 'plan' admitted by the Incumbent or Ordinary; nor to attempt at any time to disturb the soil, or the fabric, without the express authority of the Incumbent, or his Churchwarden.

*Hatchments*.—Are occasionally set up in Churches, often with the mere consent of the Incumbent; but a Faculty is necessary to *legalize* their erection. The proper appellation of this memorial is '*Achievement*;' it represents the Armorial bearings, i. e. the shield, with its quarterings and supporters, surmounted by the crest, &c. of a person of higher degree, fully emblazoned. The *Hatchment* is usually affixed to the family mansion of the Deceased for the first twelvemonth; after which it is deposited as a memorial in the Church. DR. HOOK says:—"There was formerly much of religion in Heraldry; and as the 'coat (of arms) was assumed with a religious feeling, so was it at last restored to the Sanctuary in token of thankful acknowledgment to Almighty God, with whose blessing it had been borne."—*Church Dict.*

*Incumbent's remedy*.—Should an application be made to the Incumbent for the erection of a Monument, &c. which from its size, position, or other circumstance, would be objectionable, the Incumbent may refuse to give his consent until the matter has been laid before the Ordinary. He should in the mean time represent the case to the Ordinary, and urge him to withhold his permission. Where a Monument, &c. has been already erected, and presents an objectionable appearance, the Incumbent has no right himself to order its removal; but he must persuade the Ordinary to direct it to be taken down. In no cases of the kind should the Incumbent *act* without the authority of his Canonical superior. It is however acknowledged to be the duty of the Incumbent to interfere in such cases; but how far he may proceed to act in the performance of his duty, is a question of very great doubt, and consequently calls for the exercise of much caution. The late Sir H. JENNER FUST remarked:—"The Clergyman 'of the Parish is the proper person to proceed in such a case, 'for to the Incumbent belongs the general superintendence of the 'Church and Churchyard; and it is his duty to take care that no 'Monument should be placed there, which could be the means of 'disseminating doctrines inconsistent with the established religion.'" (*Brecks v. Woolfry*. 1 Curt. 880.).

*Images*.—It cannot be recommended to permit the setting up of *Images* or *figures*, as decorations of Monuments,

Tombs, Tablets &c: yet where they exist they may not be removed without the consent of the Ordinary; and some authorities affirm, that it cannot be done even then, by reason of the proviso in the Statute 3 & 4 *Edw. VI. c. 10.*, which sanctions the continuance of such *Images, &c.* (See page 638. 683.)

*Inscriptions.—No Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c.* that in any way contravene the doctrines or discipline of the Church of England are to be put on a Monument, Gravestone, Tablet, or other Memorial. Those who persist in so doing are liable to be punished, and the Stone can be removed. The Clergyman is therefore justified in requiring all *Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c.* to be sent to him for perusal before they are written or engraven on any Memorial Stone, or Tablet, &c. The late SIR H. JENNER FUST remarked in the case of *Brecks v. Woolfry*:—‘It has not been contended, indeed it has been admitted, that if the *Inscriptions* be of the character attributed to them in the citation, viz.: contrary to the Articles, Canons, and Constitutions, and to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, no person has a right to erect a *Tombstone* with such an *Inscription* impugning the Doctrines of the Church of England, and that a person so offending is liable to be punished, and the Stone removed.’ The *Inscription* set up in the Churchyard of Carishrook, Isle of Wight, was “*Spes mea Christus.*” “*Pray for the soul of J. Woolfry,*” &c. After hearing, it was decided that such an *Inscription* was not illegal, as by no Canon or Authority of the Church in these Realms had the practice of praying for the Dead been expressly prohibited; nor did the *Inscription necessarily* involve the doctrine of Purgatory. Great stress was laid by the Advocate of *Woolfry* upon the *Inscription* on BP. BARROW in the Cathedral of St. Asaph; where were these words:—“*Orate pro conservo vestro ut inveniat misericordiam in die Domini.*” Therefore a party is not liable to an action at law for erecting, or refusing to remove, such a *Stone*. Still, it was not declared that the Ordinary, or the Incumbent acting for him, could not have given directions for the removal of the Stone, and without the risk of being proceeded against. (1 *Curt.* 880, 902.)—BURN i. 273. c; CRIPPS 432. C. G. PRIDEAUX 269; STEPHENS 213; WADDILOVE 250.

With respect to *Inscriptions* on Monuments in *Cemeteries*, see *supra* page 682.

*Lay-Rector's right.*—The *Lay-Rector* cannot erect a *Monument, Tablet &c.* in the Chancel without the consent of the Ordinary. According to the judgment given by Sir JOHN NICHOLL in *Birch v. Bushnell*, it may be gathered that the *Lay-Rector*, although possessing the freehold of the Chancel, yet (1) he is not entitled to erect a *Monument*, affix a *Tablet*, or construct a Vault without the permission of the Ordinary: for the Chancel is subject to the use of the Parishioners, the guardian of whose rights is the Ordinary. (2) He must satisfy the Ordinary that these rights will not be impaired. (3) The leave of the *Lay-Rector* must precede the application for the Faculty. (4) The *Vicar* has no power of interposing an absolute *veto*, but may

show cause against the issue of the Grant. (5) The Vicar has no fee for interments in the Chancel of common right. — BURN i. 273. c; CRIPPS 391; ROGERS 179, 519; STEPHENS 208; WADDILOVE 249; CHR. REMEMBRANCER. March 1835; SIMPSON 186.

*Metropolitan Burial District.*—The Regulations affecting Monuments, &c. imposed by the "*Metropolitan Interments Act*" (1850), passed 'to make better provision for the Interment of the Dead in and near the Metropolis,' are those of the *Cemeteries Act*, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 65., (1847) already given in page 682. thus:—

'And be it enacted, that the Clauses of the "*Cemeteries Clauses Act*, 1847," (10 & 11 Vict. c. 65.) with respect to 'exclusive Rights of Burial, and *Monumental Inscriptions* in the Cemetery, and with respect to the protection of the Cemetery, shall be incorporated with this Act; but for the purposes of this Act the expression "*the Bishop of the Diocese*," where used in the said Clauses, &c. shall mean "*the Bishop of London*."—13 & 14 Vict. c. 52. s. 64.

The privileges conferred by the Act, 10 & 11 Vict. are to be retained when Cemeteries are purchased by the Interment Board, thus:—

'Be it enacted, that for the purposes of this Act (*Metropolitan Interments Act*) the said Board (*General Board of Health*) may, if they see fit, purchase and take by Agreement 'or otherwise all or any of the *Cemeteries* mentioned in the Schedule (B) to this Act, subject to the rights to Graves, Vaults, and Monuments subsisting therein &c.'—13 & 14 Vict. c. 52. s. 7. This Act is amended by 15 & 16 Vict. c. 85.

*Mounds.*—These are to be kept in order by the relations of the Deceased: if, however, they are indifferent about the matter, *Mounds* should not be suffered to remain, as they are the chief cause of the untidy and neglected appearance of the generality of our Churchyards. The best substitute for these is a small upright stone, 12-in. or 15-in. square, set at the head and foot of the grave, just to mark the place of burial.

*Ordinary's Power.*—See *supra*. p. 687.

*Property in.*—The ownership of Monuments, Gravestones, Tablets, &c. is in the party who erected them, and if these are dead, then in the heirs of the Deceased in whose memory they were set up. (See under "*Defacing*," *supra*.)

LORD COKE says:—'Of Gravestones, Winding-Sheets, Coats of arms, Penons, or other Ensigns of honour, hanged up, laid, or placed in memory of the Dead, the property remains in the executors; and they may have actions against such as break, deface, or carry them away, or an appeal of felony.' (3 Inst. 110.) But SIR SIMON DEGGE conceives that this must be intended by 'licence of the Bishop, or consent of the Parson and Church-wardens (p. 1. c. 12).'—See DR. WATSON'S remark at page 684 *supra*.—BURN i. 372. STEPHENS 211. 214; DR. HOOK'S *Ch. Dict.* p. 453.

In *Spooner (Horner) v. Brewster*, Chief Justice BEST decided that 'the right to a Tombstone rests in the person who erects it, or 'in the heirs of the deceased in whose memory it is set up.'—BURN I. 273. *a*; STEPHENS, 213.

**Removing.**—Monuments, Gravestones, Tablets, &c. when once erected, or set up, cannot be removed without a 'Faculty' from the Ordinary, and it is nowhere said that the Rector would be justified in ordering, *suo motu*, such removal.

LORD COKE says:—'Though Tombs Sepulchres, or Monuments, may be erected for the Deceased in Church or Chancel in convenient manner, the ORDINARY must be allowed the proper judge of that conveniency, inasmuch as such erecting ought not to be to the hindrance of the celebration of Divine Service; and if they are erected without consent, and upon inquiry and inspection be found to the hindrance of Divine Service, it will not be denied that in such case the Ordinary hath sufficient authority to decree a removal without any danger of an action at law.' (GIBS. *Cod.* 453, 454.)—BURN I. 272. CRIPPS 424. DR. HOOK's *Church Dict.* p. 454.

In *Maidman v. Malpas* it was decided, that a Monument once erected cannot be taken down without the consent of the Ordinary. (1 Hagg. Con. 205. 212; see *Rich v. Bushnell*, 4 Hagg. 164; *Wilson v. Mc Math*, 3 Phil. 89.) And in *Hopper v. Davis* it was declared, 'the Ordinary may order a Monument to be taken down 'if placed inconveniently; but the Court here intimates, that the 'Incumbent's consent will usually satisfy the Ordinary.' (1 Sir G. Lee, 640.). In *Spooner (Horner) v. Brewster*, it was also laid down, that 'trespass might be maintained for taking away a Tombstone from a Churchyard, and obliterating an Inscription made upon it, at the suit of the party by whom it was erected, although 'the freehold of the Churchyard is in the Parson.' (10 Moore, 494; 3 Bing. 136; 2 C. & P. 34.)—BURN I. 273, 273. *a*; ROGERS 157, 518; STEPHENS 212, 213; WADDILOVE 249.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) states:—'If the Minister should remove, or cause to be removed, any Monuments or Tombstones in 'the Churchyard, the Churchwardens should proceed against him 'for a nuisance; or the Wife or executors of the deceased, who set 'them up, or the heir of the deceased in such case might have 'their action against the Minister, or indeed against Churchwardens themselves, and much more against a Stranger.' (Com. Dig. Cem. C.)—*L. of Ch. and Cl.* p. 430.

MR. C. J. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) remarks:—'Monuments, Coats of Arms, Paintings on the Windows, or elsewhere, 'Pennants, Hatchments, &c., put in the Church for the memory of 'the deceased buried there, if regularly set up with the consent of 'the Minister who hath the freehold, cannot be pulled down again, 'either by the Churchwardens, Minister, or Ordinary, because 'they belong to the heir, and he will have his action upon the case 'against any that meddle with them (COKE Lit. 186.); and so may 'also the Churchwardens. (*Bishop v. Turner*, Godb. 279.)'—*Chw. Guide*, 268.

MR. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*), adds:—'Committing a Nuisance' in a Churchyard is an Ecclesiastical offence, and pulling

'down a Tombstone and erecting another may be so considered. (*Bardin (Burton) v. Calcott*, 3 Phil. 90. *Maidman v. Matpus ib.*)'—*Ecccl. L.* 263.; so in STEPHENS 365.

If *Monuments* are put up without the consent of the Ordinary he may remove them. (*Palmer v. Bp. of Exeter*, 1 Stra. 576.)—STEER, 37.

In *Rebuilding Churches*, it is permitted by Statute Law to remove all Monuments, &c.; thus :—'All Tombstones, Monuments, and Monumental Inscriptions in such Church so to be taken down are carefully to be preserved by the Churchwardens, and when the Church is rebuilt on the same or a more convenient site, to be set up by the Churchwardens at the charge of the Parish in such *new Church*, as near as circumstances will admit, in the situations from whence they were removed in the Church so to be taken down.'—59 *Geo. III. c.* 134. s. 40.

*Repair.*—Monuments, Gravestones, Tablets, &c., when once erected, may be repaired and kept in order without any fresh permission from the Ordinary, or Incumbent; this may indeed be of public consequence in tracing family descents &c. It is necessary however to apply to the *Churchwardens* for leave to do so, as they are held to be the legal guardians of the Church and Churchyard; this however is a mere matter of form, as they are bound to grant leave as far as their authority extends, and by refusing would incur the censure of the Ecclesiastical court; for decency and propriety require that these Memorials should not remain in a state of ruin and decay. Should they continue to be in a state of dilapidation, and the owner, or the heir, refuse to repair them, application must be made to the Ordinary, before they can be removed; to do so without his permission would be punishable. (*Bardin v. Calcott*, 1 Hagg. Cons. 16.)—CRIPPS 424; ROGERS 156. 518. n.; STEER 36; STEPHENS 214; WADDILOVE 249; CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, *June and August*, 1823.

*Tablets.*—These are generally looked upon by the Ordinary in a more favourable light than *Monuments*, and *Tombs* properly so called; and a Faculty is usually granted for their erection with little demur. It is necessary that the *Plans and dimensions* of the proposed Tablet should be submitted to the Ordinary, and proof given that the erection will not be injurious to the convenience, beauty, or stability of the Fabric (*Rich v. Bushnell*, 4 Hagg. Con. 172. 175.)—ROGERS 122. 518; WADDILOVE 249.

*Vicar's right.*—In the case of *Rich v. Bushnell*, the VICAR objected to the right claimed by the *Lay-Rector* of making a vault and setting up a Tablet in the Chancel without payment to him of a Fee. The *Vicar* affirmed that no one could be buried or affix a Tablet in the Church, or in any part thereof, without his leave, and for which he is entitled to a Fee; and that be, as Incumbent, was to judge in each particular case whether the erection of a Tablet will occasion inconvenience or deformity. The *Lay-Rector* urged that as sole proprietor of the Chancel he was entitled to a Faculty. SIR JOHN NICHOLL considered 'that it

'was incumbent on the *Vicar* to convince the Court that his consent must precede the leave of the Ordinary....It may be doubtful whether the consent of the *Vicar* is necessary to the construction of, or to the *affixing a Tablet even in the body of the Church*, or whether he has, in such a case, a claim to a Fee unless when established by special custom. Even if his right to a Fee in such a case were conceded, it would not necessarily follow that a Faculty for the construction of a Vault, or the *erection of a Tablet* in the Chancel, must be refused unless he consented to the grant. The grant of a Faculty would not preclude the *Vicar* from enforcing his Fees, if he were legally entitled to them. The opinion of the *Vicar* against the expediency of granting a Faculty would have its due weight with the Ordinary; but if the cause shewn by him be nothing better than his will or pleasure, it will be insufficient to stay the grant; still more so, if his consent be mere matter of purchase and barter....The *Vicar* has not a positive right of refusal, though he may very properly show cause against the grant of the Faculty by stating the grounds of 'his objection.' (4 Hagg. 154.).—BURN I. 273. c.; ROGERS 519; STEPHENS 207.

It is now time that we address ourselves to the consideration of the *style* and *character* of these Memorials of the Dead, and since we have already consumed much space on the *legal portion* of the subject—not, we trust, more than its importance demanded—our remarks shall be as brief as possible, and the quotations few.

The *style* and *character* of the MONUMENTS, GRAVESTONES, and Memorial TABLETS of later times—of times, that is to say, subsequent to the Reformation, and down to the present age—are considered by most writers of our day, who have treated upon the subject, to be of heathen origin, and therefore very inappropriate to a Christian Churchyard. They particularly speak against—'The weeping Niches, drooping willows, draperied obelisks; and those small sepulchral ornaments, such as,—*Winged Cherubs*, intended to be emblematical of Angels keeping watch; *flying doves*, symbolical of the Holy Spirit, or of the innocence of the departed; *torches*, inverted or extinguished, declaring hope to be at an end, or marking, undesignedly perhaps with some, the Sadducean doctrine of the extinct soul; *poppies* also, indicating an eternal sleep, thus propagating the same error. To which may be added the more common types of mortality,—*scythes*, *hour-glasses*, *spades*, *mattocks*, *skulls* and *cross-bones*, Grecian *fillets*, and Pagan *urns*.' In



place of these unchristian emblems, it has been recommended that we should revert to the ante-Reformation use of the symbol of the *Cross* in all its varied adaptations to the flat and coped Gravestone, Head-stone, and Wood Memorial; or that we should again recur to Monumental *Brasses*, and *Obituary Windows*. In many instances, where the popular mind has not been so inseparably wedded to customary usages as to to interpose objections to every change, these latter Monumental ornaments have been re-introduced without disapprobation and without suspicion. How far they may be considered correct, and generally admissible, may be best gathered from a glance at their history, which, perhaps, we cannot do better than abbreviate from the *Glossary of Architecture*, as follows:—‘The earliest *Tombs* found in this country...of an architectural character are the *Stone Coffins* of the 11th and 12th centuries; the covers of these were at first simply *coped* (en dos d’ane).... afterwards frequently ornamented with *crosses* of various kinds, and other devices, and sometimes had inscriptions on them: subsequently they were sculptured with *recumbent figures* in high relief; but still generally diminishing in width from the head to the feet, to fit the *Coffins* of which they formed the lids.... These figures usually had *Canopies*, which were often richly carved over their heads.... This kind of *Tomb* was sometimes placed beneath low arches or recesses, formed within the substance of the Church wall, usually about 7 ft. in length, and not more than 3 ft. high above the coffin even in the centre; these arches...often remain when the *figure* or *brass*, and perhaps the coffin itself, has long disappeared and been forgotten... Towards the end of the 13th century, these *Canopies* became gradually enriched with crockets, finials, and other architectural details. In the reign of *Edward I*, the tombs of persons of rank began to be ornamented on the sides with *Armorial bearings*, and small sculptured Statues, within pedimental canopied recesses.... *Altar*, or *Table-Tombs*, called by LELAND “*high-tombs*,” with recumbent effigies, are common during the whole of the 14th century.... Towards the middle of the 13th century the custom commenced, and in the earlier part of the 14th prevailed, of inlaying *flat stones with Brasses*; and sepulchral *Inscriptions* though they had not yet become general, are more frequently to be met with. The sides of these *tombs* are sometimes relieved with niches, surmounted by decorated pediments, each containing a small sculptured figure; sometimes with arched panels filled with tracery. Other *Tombs* about the same period, but more frequently in the 15th century, were decorated along the sides with large square panelled compartments richly foliated, or quatrefoiled, and containing shields. Many of the *Tombs* of the 15th and 16th centuries appear beneath arched recesses, fixed in, or projecting from, the wall, and enclosing the *Tomb* on three sides; these were constructed so as to form *Canopies*.... In the early part of the 16th century the Monuments were generally of a similar character to those of the preceding age; but *alabaster slabs* with figures on them, cut in outline were frequently used. The *Altar-Tombs* with figures in Niches, carved in bold relief, were also frequently of alabaster.... Towards the middle of this

'century the Italian style of architecture had come into general use....In the two following centuries every sort of *barbarism* was introduced on Funeral Monuments; but the ancient style lingered longer in some places than in others.' (p. 244.)—Vol. 1. 4th Edition.

We will now briefly discuss each kind of Memorial in order.

The *Altar-Tomb* is considered by many to be the fittest, and most correct form for a Sepulchral Monument, particularly in Cathedrals; but its size is, generally speaking, prohibitory to its admission into the interior of Parish Churches: besides which, the expence of a 'Faculty,' and the Rectorial 'fee' for the mere permission to erect such a Memorial, added to the cost of its construction, interdict its adoption by any but the most wealthy. The more sumptuous Tombs of this kind are often surmounted by a statue, or recumbent effigy of the deceased; and are occasionally enriched with tabernacle work, and decorated canopies. Some *Altar-Tombs* occupy a recess in the wall, while others assume the appearance of a piscina niche. Our limited space, however, will not permit us to go into detail, so that we must refer our Readers, who wish for additional information, to those authors who have written exclusively on this branch of the subject.

The REV. J. ARMSTRONG says:—'While nothing can be more beautiful than *Altar-Tombs* with either the figure of the *Cross*, or of the *Deceased*, we should be sparing in erecting them in Parish Churches; there is no room; the walls may be thick enough here and there to admit of an arched recess; where they are, let *Altar-Tombs* be by all means introduced; but even then they would run a chance of being hidden by the seats, which fill every nook and corner. In Cathedrals there are many admirable positions; in Parish Churches, the walls above the seats, and the Windows, are all we have to spare for the memory of the dead; the living crowd the rest.' (p. 18).—*Paper on Monuments*.

\* \* Consult GOUGH's *Sepulchral Monuments*; also E. BLORE's *Monumental Remains*, 4to. £1. 10s.; M. H. BLOXAM's *Monumental Architecture*, 8vo. 12s.; S. GEARY's *Cemetery Designs for Tombs and Cenotaphs*, 8vo. 10s. 6d.; T. FAULKNER's *Designs for Mural Monuments, &c.*, 4to. 15s.; T. & G. HOLLIS's *Monumental Effigies, &c.*, in Parts, folio, 12s. each; W. H. KELKE's *Notices of Sepulchral Monuments*, 8vo. 3s. 6d.; DR. MARKLAND's *Remarks on English Churches*, 12mo. 6s. 6d.; C. A. STOTHARD's *Monumental Effigies*, folio, £8. 8s.; C. TOTTIE's *Designs for Sepulchral Monuments*, folio, £1. 16s.; E. W. TRENDLE's *Designs for Monuments, Cenotaphs, &c.*, 4to. £1. 1s.; T. YOUNG's *Monumental Pillars with Reflections*, 12mo. 5s. 6d.

*Brasses*.—Full length representations of the Deceased engraven in *brass*—are occasionally being revived amongst

us, but not to an extent to require a very lengthy notice in this place; they arose about the middle of the 13th century, and were usually fixed to slabs in the pavement of the Church; very frequently they were placed upright against the wall, and at other times, when of a smaller kind, they occupied some recess. The expence of their construction, however, is too great to admit of their general adoption.

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE describes them as:—‘Monumental plates of *brass*, or the mixed metal anciently called *latten*, inlaid on large slabs of stone, which usually form part of the pavement of the Church, and representing in their outline, or by the lines engraved upon them, the figure of the Deceased. In many instances in place of a figure there is found an ornamental or foliated *Cross*, with sacred emblems, or other devices. The fashion of representing on Tombs the *effigy* of the Deceased graven on a plate of *brass*, which was imbedded in melted pitch, and firmly fastened down by rivets leaded into a slab, usually in this country known as Forest marble, or else Sussex or Purbeck marble, appears to have been adopted about the middle of the 13th century. These Memorials, when circumstances permitted, were often elevated upon Altar-Tombs, but more commonly they are found on slabs, which form part of the pavement of Churches, and it is not improbable that this kind of Memorial was generally adopted, from the circumstance, that the area of the Church, and especially the Choir was not thereby encumbered, as was the case when effigies in relief were introduced.’ (p. 61—9.)—*Vol. I.* 4th edition.

In a Tract ‘A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS, the following useful directions are given with respect to *Monumental Brasses*: ‘Those of *Brass*, inlaid in the floor of the Church, have been stolen and sold for the sake of the paltry sum they would fetch; the *alabaster* figures have sometimes been broken up from mere wantonness, and sometimes ground into powder for cattle medicines.\*....*Brasses* are of all things most likely to be hurt. They may be quite worn out by the many feet that pass over them. You must hinder this as well as you can. If the nails which fasten them to the stone come out, the holes should be filled with pitch, and the nails driven in again....Do not let such *Brasses* be rubbed, like a brass kettle, to keep them bright: for you thus wear away all the marks in them, and make them worth nothing....There is a way of *taking copies* of them by laying thin paper upon them, and rubbing it over with black lead, or with what is called heel-ball.’ (p. 9.)—*Part. I.*

\* A List of MONUMENTAL BRASSES in England has been published by Rivington in 8vo. 5s. Further information may be gathered from C. BOUTELL’S *Monumental Brasses and Slabs* 8vo. 10s. 6d; *Monumental Brasses of England*, by the same author, royal 8vo. £1. 8s; J. S. COTMAN’S *Sepulchral Brasses of Norfolk*

---

\* *Alabaster* is but another name for *sulphate of lime*, commonly known as *Gypsum*, and *Plaster of Paris*, and now much used as a Chemical manure.—*Ed.*

&c. 2 vols. imp. 4to. £6. 6s ; J. G. WALLER's *Monumental Brasses in England*, in 16 Parts, folio, 6s. each. The following may also be perused with advantage:—*A Manual for the study of Monumental Brasses*, 8vo. 10s. 6d ; and *The Monumental Brasses and Slabs in Belgium*, 4to. 15s.—

*Gravestones, &c.*—The style of *Gravestone* that has been lately recommended for general adoption in Church-yards may be described as—(1) either a *flat* or *coped stone* ; which can be plain, or ornamented with a simple or foliated *cross*, and have an *Inscription* round the outer edge: this stone should be narrower at the feet than at the head:—(2) or, *Head-stones*, having on the upper portion a sculptured *cross* in relief, or, as it is sometimes termed, in *Cameo*, or the *Cross* may be perforated. The *Inscription* to be engraven below it:—(3) or, upright *crosses* of stone or wood, with the *Inscription* cut on one or more of the limbs of the cross. It is very essential to the neat appearance of a Church-yard that *Mounds* be done away with ; they are productive of rank coarse grass inaccessible to the scythe, and when not attended to soon become shapeless and untidy heaps.

The REV. J. ARMSTRONG says:—‘It is a thing most strange ‘most inconsistent, that while people now-a-days object to the ‘outward signs and types of hope and faith, there never has been ‘any popular outcry raised against the outward signs and emblems ‘of heathen superstition and infidelity. Christian Tombs are ‘every where marked with infidelity ; pious people rejoice in the ‘mark, while the *Cross* is deemed a badge of superstition, and an ‘approach to doctrinal corruption.’ (p. 16.)—‘We have not to ‘rack our inventions for substitutes for the present abominations ‘...I allude to the varieties of the *Cross*, which would form such ‘exquisite *Headstones* ; two only do I know of raised as yet in this ‘neighbourhood....the expense of one was 45s. of the other 34s. ‘country workmen would doubtless supply them at a cheaper rate.’ (p. 22.)—*Paper on Monuments.*

The REV. J. W. HEWETT remarks:—‘Experience has led me ‘to consider those Church-yards the fairest in which *Mounds* over ‘Graves are not allowed. Unless constantly attended to, they crumble away, or encourage rank grass. *Headstones* should be placed, ‘as their name imports, at the head of the Grave, not as too often ‘happens, at its foot ; their *Inscriptions* should face the west. I ‘need not argue against the ugly Pagan forms with which ‘we have been too long conversant, for those beautiful little ‘*Crosses*....are now becoming general.’ (p. 15.)—*Arrang. of Par. Churches.*

Dr. MARKLAND, speaking of the CHURCH-YARD, says:—‘Fitting sepulchral Memorials should be introduced,—the *Cross*, ‘that appropriate, solemn, and consolatory emblem, the victorious ‘sign and badge of faith and hope, should be especially selected— ‘*Cherubs’ heads, scythes, hour-glasses, flower-pots*, and designs ‘positively ridiculous, or worse—of a Pagan, rather than a Chris-

'tian character—should be excluded.' (p. 37.).—*Rever. Due to Holy Places*. 3rd edit. In another work this Author remarks:—  
'A simple *Stone*, to mark the spot where the loved ashes of our relations and friends repose, and inscribed with their *names*, a *date*, and a *text of Scripture*, is a record of affection, and reverence, and hope; it has received the sanction of ages; finds "an echo in every bosom," and is consonant with all the best feelings of the heart.' (p. 74. With respect to the use of the Cross; see p. 190).—*Remarks on English Churches*. 3rd. edit.

THE REV. F. E. PAGET observes:—'*Scythes* and *hour-glasses*, *mattocks* and *shovels*, *skulls* and *cross-bones*, being frequently intermingled, and placed, as it were, in a group, at the head of a *Grave-stone*, may be classed together, and one condemnation passed on them all. It is not that they are unmeaning, or that their meaning is objectionable, but they are mere symbols, and not very imposing symbols, while the *Grave* itself, over which they stand, is a stern, and awful, and striking reality; awaking far more solemn thoughts, than these mere types of mortality can do....*scythes*, and *skulls*, and *spades* might be appropriate enough for a heathen, but a Christian wants something more. The same thing may be said of that most offensive class of Ornaments—*Urns*, and reversed or extinguished *torches*; both are copied from Pagan tombs.... What the intended meaning of the *fillets* or *chaplets*, which are sometimes introduced on Christian tombs, copied from Greek designs, may be, I really have no idea.... There is *one* emblem, perfectly unobjectionable, perfectly appropriate, full of solemnity, full of consolation, &c.... That emblem, I need scarcely say, is the Cross: that emblem (alas! that I should say it,) is almost never to be seen on our Monuments, or in our Church-yards.... I would have you calmly reflect whether the *money* which you purpose to lay out in a *Tomb-stone* might not be better spent; and by better, I mean with equal reverence and affection for the departed, but in a manner more useful to the living, and more directly to the honour of God. Look round the Church. Is there a new *Prayer-Book* wanted for the Reading-Desk? A *Dish* to collect the *Alms* in at the Holy-Communion? A new *Altar-Cloth*? Or is there a *Window* which would be the handsomer for the insertion of some *painted glass*? Why should you not consecrate your service to God, and at the same time make an enduring memorial of your deceased friend, by purchasing those things, and letting it appear upon them by some suitable Inscription that they were given in commemoration of the departed'.... (If a *Tomb-Stone* is preferred, he proceeds).... 'I would advise in this case you make your Monument of *free-stone*, instead of *slate*, that it be neither high, nor wide (both being very unsightly), and that instead of going to the Stoue-Mason and getting his opinion, you consult the Clergyman of the Parish'.... (The author then recommends three kinds of *Grave-stones*).... 'The *first*, is the most expensive.... It is copied from the *copied tombs* of the 11th and 12th centuries. Each of these has the emblem of the *Cross* sculptured upon it; an *Inscription* may be placed on either side of the Cross: or else (as in Pl. 2.), which is merely a *flat slab*, it may run along the outer edge. The *second* class of *Tomb-stones*, which I recommend, would be *stone crosses* with Inscriptions, to set up at the heads of

'Graves. The last and cheapest Memorial.... would be plain *'oak crosses* with painted Inscriptions....these would vary in 'price from one to three pounds.' (p. 20—25).—*Tract upon Tomb-Stones*.

The REV. J. SANDFORD remarks:—'But the affection which 'suggests them (Memorials) would often be better shewn, and the 'perpetuity sought for better secured, by works which, while they 'commemorate the Departed, also confer benefits on the living. 'Where wealth is at command, how much better to expend the 'sum devoted to the memory of the dead on some useful and 'charitable work, the erection or endowment of a Church, School, 'or Alms-house, than on a pile of marble, which, however graceful, 'is wholly useless....Where the means are limited, still some 'addition or improvement to the House of God—for instance, the 'erection of a Font, or the restoration of a Window—would serve 'all the purposes of a Memorial. And where a *Mural Tablet* is 'preferred, care might at least be taken that it is in keeping with 'the Church, and rather characterized by chasteness and sym-'metry, than by costliness of material. Caen or Painswick stone 'seems the best suited for the purpose of *Mural Tablets*.' (p. 38. See also p. 61).—*Parochialia*.

In 'POPULAR TRACTS,' No. III. we read:—'After the Reformation these beautiful memorials (bearing the symbol of the 'Cross) were too commonly disused; the Deceased was represented 'first kneeling, then sitting, lounging on his arm, or standing, 'and ultimately as engaged in his worldly business,—writing, 'painting, fighting, and the like; the Ornaments of the Tomb were 'heathen, and spoke of despair and infidelity, rather than of Christian hope; the *Cross* was banished as a "Popish symbol;" and 'all kinds of Monuments, whether in Churches, or Church-yards, 'became alike ugly and irreverent. From this state of things 'there is great cause of thankfulness that we are now awakening. 'The rich are returning to the sculptured *Cross*, the engraved 'plates of *Brass*, and the high *Altar-Tomb*; they frequently also 'fill a *Window* of their Church with *painted-glass*—thus making the 'memory of their earthly brother contribute to the adornment of 'their Heavenly Father's House. Even the poorer classes have 'their little *Head-stone* with its sacred badge,—that badge which 'should never be omitted in a Christian Monument, because it 'symbolizes how the faithful sleep at Evening, as in the Morning 'they have wrought, under the shadow of the *Cross* of Christ.' (p. 10).—*The Burial Service*.

In the Tract 'A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS,' when speaking of Monuments &c, it is observed:—'Nothing can be more 'unsightly than most of these, (monuments) not to say irreverent and 'profane. You may often persuade your fellow-parishioners to give up 'the ugly *Head-stones*, with their vulgar doggrel rhymes, and make 'them choose proper emblems instead of those which are now most 'common. What can be worse than *poppies*, and *broken columns*, 'which typify everlasting sleep, and thwarted hopes, instead of the 'peaceful and hopeful rest of the Christian? But of all things 'avoid *urns*: they are heathen and silly emblems, though more 'used perhaps than any thing else. Nor are they put on Monu-'ments only: I know of more than one East end stuck about with

'urns and pots of different sizes and colours; of a beautiful Porch groaning under the weight of a shapeless modern urn: and even of a Chancel arch removed altogether to make way for an urn on the top of each pier. At any rate you can hinder the mutilation of the Church itself for urns and monuments. It is a shame to cut away piers, and carvings, and mouldings, and to block up arches and windows for such things as these. It is a shame also to use Monumental Stones *over again* and thus destroy the record of one man's life to make room for that of another. And again, it is worse than dishonest to take Gravestones for one's own purposes, and even to give them away to others for door-steps and lintels, or the like use.' (p. 13.).—*Part. II.*

\* \* See also E. G. CARTER'S *Remarks on Christian Grave-stones* 8vo. 3s. 6d; and E. L. CUTTS' *Manual for the study of Sepulchral Slabs and Crosses*. 8vo. 12s.

*Inscriptions, and Epitaphs.*—The most appropriate *Inscription* for a Gravestone &c. is simply the *name, age, and date* of departure: what exceeds this is usually designated an *Epitaph*. The *Epitaph* requires the rigid supervision of the Incumbent so as to prevent the intrusion of the most ridiculous, and often blasphemous and infidel rhymes, too frequently employed to commemorate the virtues, sufferings, or worldly vocation of the Deceased. Whatever *Epitaph* is used should point to the hereafter, and be free from the taint of this lower world.

DR MARKLAND says:—'Some solemn *text* should take the place of vulgar, doggrel *Epitaphs*: both the sacred emblem, and the language of Scripture, would edify every age and every class, and at moments when lessons of seriousness would sink most deeply into the mind.' (p. 37).—*Reverence Due to Holy Places*. (See also this Author's *Remarks on English Churches*. 3d. Edit. pp. 141—172.)

The REV. F. E. PAGET states:—'It is to be feared that a great majority of modern *Epitaphs* are made up of flattery and lies... even where really deserved, they are better, far better omitted... There is one method, however, by which offence even to the most scrupulous may be avoided; and that is by making the Stone speak, as it were, for the deceased himself, and then any of the following sentences would seem a beautiful expression of Christian faith and humility: 'Mercy Jesus'? 'O Lamb of God that takest away &c.' 'God be merciful to me a sinner.' &c. &c. Sentences of this description seem the most affecting and appropriate of any... It (a Monumental Inscription) should be characterized by Christian humility, kindness, and by a disposition to say *too little*, rather than *too much*... Thus (People) frequently leave the whole matter to the taste and discretion of the Stone-mason in the next market-town, and the result is just what might be expected. (After animadverting upon the Stone-mason's materials, style of letters, ornaments &c. the author proceeds)... 'The Stone-mason has a *Book* full of Epitaphs; and one of these,—grammar, spelling and all, is, in a few weeks, transferred from the Book to the

'Stone... I do not choose to quote any of these Inscriptions for I am writing on a serious subject, but I trust the hint I have given will not be thrown away... All I would advise in this case is... that instead of going to the Stone-mason and getting his opinion, you consult the *Clergyman* of the Parish, without whose leave no Monument can be legally erected, and request him to advise you in the preparation of your intended *Inscription*'. (p. 8.) — *Tract on Tombstones*.

The REV. G. A. POOLE, after discussing this question at some length observes:—‘Let there be nothing said (to the praise) of the departed which if he was a bad man, we cannot say with truth, and if he was a good man, his humility would have rejected... the Christian *Epitaph* should be prospective rather than retrospective in its aspect: it should look forward to heaven, not back again to earth; to God’s mercy, not to man’s merits:—and, when man is concerned, to his resurrection and life in heaven, not to his deeds upon this fleeting scene, and to his death.’ (p. 133).—*Churches, their Structure &c.*

In POPULAR TRACTS No. III., we read:—'Modern *Epitaphs* have long been as offensive as the Monuments on which they are engraved. Early Inscriptions contained only the *name* of the Deceased, the *date* of his departure, and a *short-prayer* for mercy: but latterly *Epitaphs* have grown to an astonishing length, and are filled with the genealogy of the Departed, an enumeration of his virtues, and a confident assertion of felicity in Heaven. Sometimes also they are blasphemous, heretical, and in many other ways offensive.' (A few examples of the kind recommended are then annexed).—*On the Burial Service*, p. 10.

The QUARTERLY REVIEW writes:—‘There is a befitting pathos in the brief unadorned Inscription more eloquent than a Jeremiad of lamentations. “*Filio unico et charissimo parentes infeliciissimi*,” tells a tale of domestic distress which individual experience will, in general, fill up with bitter fidelity. In such cases to imitate the Romans in brevity awakes a sympathy which the utmost babbling of loquacious sorrow never can.’ (p. 310.)—Vol. XXXIX.

\* \* Additional information with respect to *Inscriptions &c.* may be derived from consulting a little work entitled '*Epitaphs Original and Selected with Essays by a Clergyman*,' post 8vo. 5s. published by Parker. See also "*Scriptural Epitaphs*," 18mo. 2s. 6d. published by Smith and Elder; and L. BOOKER's *Tribute to the Dead; Epitaphs*, 12mo. 3s.; and J. SNOW's *Lyra Memorialis, Original Epitaphs*, &c. 18mo. 3s. 6d. Examples of the ordinary kind may be seen in GRAHAM's *Collection of Epitaphs*, 12mo. 6s. 6d.; and in G. MOGRIDGE's *Church-yard Lyrist; Epitaphs*, &c. 12mo. 5s.

If a *Latin Inscription* is required, the Reader is recommended to study a little Tract entitled '*Rules for the Composition of Latin Inscriptions*'. 8vo. 1s. 6d. published by Whittaker.

*Obituary Windows.*—The illumination of Windows with figures, or devices, in *stained glass*, as Memorials of departed friends is becoming prevalent among the wealthier portion of



our congregations; and where already introduced they have obtained general approval. It requires, however, extreme care in the selection of the subject, in the tone of colouring employed, and skill also in the execution of the design. The judgment of the Incumbent will be especially called into exercise when granting his permission to introduce an *Obituary Window*. The subject however is of too vast and important a nature to be satisfactorily discussed in these pages, so that we will merely give a quotation or two, and refer the Reader to those authors who have written fully on the question; first observing, however, that there exists one great objection to the '*Obituary*,' or indeed any *illuminated Window*, and that is its liability to injury both from the careless within the Church, and from the idle and unruly without.

THE REV. J. ARMSTRONG observes:—'*Obituary Windows* of richly painted glass serve every purpose which the pious affection of surviving relatives can desire. . . . The idea of expence may deter some from the use of that which they prefer, but I think it might be so contrived that beautiful memorials of this sort should prove far less expensive than those of a very ordinary description, which the yard of a modern statuary is wont to furnish. It is by no means an absolute necessity that a family should fill a whole window in commemorating the relative they have lost. Take a Window of three lights; why not let one family begin with the centre light, another in course of time fills the other, and so on? . . . The expence of a single light of a moderate sized Window in the very richest glass would be from about £12. to £15., a sum so often exceeded by a marble affair of urns and torches; while I doubt not that Incumbents would be proud to remit the 'fees' for the glory of the Church. . . . A figure of some sort, either of a Saint, or of the person to be commemorated, seems to be the fittest design for the purpose; when the latter is desired a difficulty arises concerning the dress. There can be no objection in complying with the wish for perpetuating *likenesses*, for it is a well known fact that the *Brasses*, the *figures* on the Altar-Tombs, and those on the few old *Obituary Windows* extant, do express the features of the dead, in short, are *likenesses*. . . . When a Window of many lights is fixed upon for *Obituary* purposes, the first design must be the pattern of the rest, and should not in this case be a *likeness*, but the representation of a *Saint*, that the rest may be made more easily to harmonize with it, and with each other. The name of the Deceased, and the date of his *birth*, and *death*, with any holy text, might in all cases be written in old English characters at the bottom of the figure, whether it were a likeness, or not.' (p. 20.)—*Paper on Monuments*.

DR. MARKLAND speaks of *Heraldic* devices thus:—'*Windows* exclusively occupied by, and resplendent with *Heraldry*, especially those which are placed over and near the Altar, are as objectionable as monumental statuary; subjects of the most sacred character obviously present themselves as alone fitted for holy places. At the same time in the building and restoration of Churches, Armorial bearings are not to be discarded; they mark both dates and

'facts—they form a language universally understood by Antiquaries, and may be agreeably and suitably introduced both in glass 'at the base of Windows—and in stone or wood—as in dripstone terminations, hammer beams, or within and about Porches and Door ways. But *Heraldry* and *Inscriptions* should be mere accessories, and in complete subserviency to the Windows, or to any other portion of the fabric where they may be introduced.' (p. 86).—*Reverence Due to Holy Places.*

•• Several works containing Examples of ancient *Stained Glass Windows*, &c. have been lately published; among which may be mentioned W. WARRINGTON'S *History of Ancient stained Glass*, folio £6. 6s.; O. B. CARTER'S *Ancient Painted Glass in Winchester Cathedral* 4to. £1. 16s.; also an *Inquiry into the difference of Style in ancient Glass Paintings*, 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 10s.; and J. GILBERT'S *Stained Glass of Canterbury Cathedral* &c. 4to. 5s. The student may be also referred to J. BALLANTINE'S *Treatise on Painted Glass*, royal 8vo. 10s. 6d; W. POLE'S Translation of M. A. GESSERT'S *Art of Painting on Glass*, 4to. 4s.; and CHARLES WINSTON'S *Introduction to the Study of Painted Glass*. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Tablets.*—The erection of Monumental *Tablets* against the walls of a Church has, since the revival of Ecclesiastical decoration, met with much discouragement: and certainly in an architectural point of view very little, if any thing, can be said in commendation of most of those which have come under our observation: nor indeed can much be stated in favour of the general embellishments applied to *mural Tablets*. Their circumscribed space precludes the admission of lengthy *Epitaphs* on departed worth and virtue, and consequently saves them for the most part from that censure to which the indulgence of this taste on the more capacious Gravestone is frequently exposed. Another operating cause in this respect doubtlessly is, that *Tablets* exact a more rigid scrutiny on the part of the Incumbent; and necessarily so, as these Memorials stand perpetually confronting the eye of the Officiating Minister, and the assembled Congregation. The introduction therefore of anything, in the least way, objectionable on the score of religious sentiment, or doctrine, should be most rigorously prohibited. Having already in preceding remarks spoken sufficiently on this subject, we will conclude with a few opinions.

The REV. J. ARMSTRONG thus censures *Monumental Tablets*:—'As to the walls what a miserable mutilation and disfigurement 'it is to turn them into Monumental Mosaic, and to fill them 'with all kinds of slabs of all kinds of shapes packed confusedly together, and to take not a little from the height of the 'building by breaking into endless stages the fair surface of the 'wall.... If, however, the wall must in some degree be used.... I 'would direct your attention to the Piscina.... in St. John's Chapel 'in Exeter Cathedral. In certain positions exact models of these, 'but slightly increased in size, might be placed without hurt;

'Brasses being introduced at the back of the arch, which would afford, happily, not over much space for an Inscription.' (p. 19.).  
—*Paper on Monuments.*

DR. MARKLAND speaking of common-place Monuments and Tablets observes:—'On the walls of many Churches, instead of contributing to the beauty of the fabric they are little better than unsightly excrescences (p. 75). . . . For more than a century, mural Monuments, with cherubs, skulls, lamps, and twisted columns, with little variety, were permitted to deform our Churches. In later days, we have had the urn and the sarcophagus,—strange ornaments in a Christian Temple! or a figure, veiled with drapery, sitting under a willow, bending over a tomb, or a boy leaning upon an inverted torch! These designs have become wearisome, and uninteresting from repetition, and unless they proceed from the chisel of a master, cannot but be wholly disregarded.' (p. 88.).—*Remarks on Churches*, 3rd. edit.

The REV. G. A. POOLE says:—'There is a large class of persons, who cannot afford the Altar-Tomb, or the recumbent figure, who wish for, and will have, some other record than the stone in the Church-yard, or the simple covering of the vault. The square Tablet, with Grecian entablatures, &c., and with the usual proportion of urns, and death's heads, must take flight before something of more pretension to harmony with the Church in which they are erected; but what is to supply their place? The favourite plan at present is to magnify *ad libitum* some Niche, or Piscina, and to suspend it, without any reference to propriety of place, just where the Tablet may be best read. . . . but it might be as congruous to imitate an Altar-Tomb for a Priest's seat, as to imitate a Piscina for a Monumental Tablet' . . . (After animadverting upon the impropriety of an elevated position for an imitation of a piscina, the author alludes to the religious feeling which . . .) 'directs the eye downwards to the pavement for their meek memorials, and not upwards for their blazoned pretensions.' (p. 119.).—*Churches, Their Structure, &c.*

### [Organs, and Organists.]

An *Organ* is usually ranked among the 'Ornaments of the Church' although it will not be found prescribed in any CANON, LAW, or RUBRIC. On referring to Ecclesiastical authorities, it appears to be laid down, however, that an *Organ* is 'necessary in Cathedrals, but ornamental only in Parish Churches;—"necessary" and "ornamental," that is to say, with respect to the manner of performing the Divine Services. As Cathedral establishments are generally regulated by peculiar statutes, the authorities maintaining and defending their usages cannot be brought

to support the introduction of the same practices in Parochial Churches: so that, although the providing of an *Organ* may be enforced by the Ordinary in the case of a Cathedral, yet it cannot be enjoined in the case of a Parish Church. As regards the latter, an *Organ*, 'like many other things for which no provision is made by any special law, must be referred to the general power of the Churchwardens, with the consent of the majority of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled, and the permission of the Ordinary,' before it can be introduced; from the fact of its admission involving many important considerations, which might affect the rights either of the Parish, or of individuals. An *Organ*—'a complete *Organ*,' properly so called,—is not only costly in its original purchase, but involves considerable outlay in its erection. It also occupies much valuable space in a Church, and may entail upon the Parishioners continual charges for repairs, and for the salary of the *Organist*:—all these questions have to be previously considered, and provided for, to the satisfaction of the Ordinary. Notwithstanding the first cost may be met by voluntary contributions, or the *Organ* be a donation, perhaps, from the Incumbent, or from a wealthy Parishioner, yet this will not of itself be sufficient to obtain the Ordinary's consent: much will depend upon the size of the Church, and the circumstances of the Parish, in determining the propriety of issuing a Faculty for the erection of an *Organ*. And without a Faculty it must by no means be attempted.

The several points demanding especial consideration will be best understood by a reference to the 'decisions' of the Ecclesiastical Courts; particularly to those bearing upon—(1st) the *erection* and *repair* of an *ORGAN*; (2nd) the *appointment* and *Salary* of the *ORGANIST*; and (3rdly) the *control* over the performance of the *Organ*, as well as over the *Singers*, and the *Singing*. &c.

After discussing the various *legal* questions, we will then advert to these ancient usages, which have

respect to *Instrumental Music* generally in Churches; and conclude with a few observations upon the size, construction, and position of the *Organ* of modern times.

The *Erection* of an *Organ* in a Parish Church is dependent upon various contingencies, which are left entirely to the discretion of the Ordinary, as we shall gather from the following authorities.

LORD STOWELL (*Sir W. Scott*) remarks:—‘It may be difficult in some cases to distinguish whether an addition of this kind to the Service of the Church is to be deemed ‘*necessary*’ or ‘*ornamental*,’ because ORGANS in some Churches may be ‘*necessary*, though in others ornamental. In Cathedral Churches they would, I conceive, be deemed necessary, and the ORDINARY might compel the Dean and Chapter to erect an *Organ*, as ‘*proper and necessary for the Service usually performed in such places.*’ (*The Chw. of St John’s, Margate v. Parishioners, Vicar &c. of the same*: 1 Hagg. Cons. 199.).—BURN’S *Eccl. L. Phil.* 1. 97; 374. a.; CRIPP’S *L. Rel. to Ch. and Cl.* 420; C. G. PRIDEAUX’S *Chw. Guide*, 200; ROGER’S *Ecc. L.* 514; STEER’S *Par. L. Clive*, 37; STEPHEN’S *L. Rel. to Cl.* 290; *ib. B. of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. 365.

SIR J. NICHOLL says:—‘In a Collegiate Church an ORGAN may be necessary from the manner in which the Service is there performed, but in a Parish Church it is not an article of legal necessity.... The erection of *Organs* in Parish Churches is not to be discouraged, if the circumstances of the Parish, regard being had to its opulence and population, and to the size of its Church, offer no objections. Of these circumstances the ORDINARY is to judge; on any expence to be incurred, the Parish alone is to decide.’ (*Jay v. Webber*, 3 Hagg. 8.) WADDILOVE’S *Digest*, 253.—See also BURN I. 374. a; STEPHENS *L.* 290.

SIR W. WYNNE observes:—‘An ORGAN is not necessary in a Parish Church for the decent performance of Divine Worship; therefore the *Parishioners* are not bound to provide an *Organ*; but though it is not necessary, it is extremely decent, proper, and even customary, in a Parish that is extensive and opulent.’ (*Pearce v. Rector of Clapham*, 3 Hagg. 12.)—WADDILOVE. *ib.* 253.

In the case of *Randall v. Collins*, it was stated, that in Parish Churches it would depend on the circumstances of the Parish: in London where the Parishes are small, and rents high, an *Organ* might be a considerable burden. (2 Sir G. Lee 217.).—ROGERS 514.

*Faculty necessary.*—The consent of the ORDINARY is indispensable to the erection of an *Organ* in a Parish Church; the Faculty however merely grants the permission, without imposing any charges on the Parishioners. The cost of a ‘Faculty’ in this Diocese (*Ely*) is £16.

SIR W. WYNNE states:—‘An ORGAN cannot be *legally* erected in a Parish Church without a *Faculty*, and a Faculty is not granted without a decree, and *intimation to the Parishioners* in order that any one may object; but the consent of the Parishioners does not bind the ORDINARY; it is in his discretion to grant or withhold, but he should not be inclined to discourage the erection of an *Organ*.’ (*Pearce v. Rector of Clapham*, 3 Hagg. 12.)—ROGERS 515; STEPHENS L. 200; *ib. B. of C. Pr.* 365; WADDILOVE 253.

*Future Expences.*—The cost of future repair, and the Salary of the Organist, cannot legally be laid on the Church-Rates by a Faculty: where no endowment has been secured, and no part of Pew-rents available, these expences must be defrayed by ‘*voluntary contributions*.’ It appears to be the opinion of SIR J. NICHOLL, that where the circumstances of the Parish have seemed to require such protection, Courts have usually inserted a clause that *no expence shall fall upon the Parish*; sometimes merely requiring several persons to certify that they are willing to subscribe to provide a settled fund for the maintenance of an *Organist*, though no permanent endowment is arranged; a *fund for the present* being all that is usually required. In other cases a clause for a settled fund is inserted according to the discretion of the ORDINARY, there being *no rule of Law* requiring the introduction of such a clause at all. (*Jay v. Webber*, 3 Hagg. 4.)—And the omission of a clause of exoneration from future expences will not render the Faculty void. (*ib.* 10.)—ROGERS 515.

If a Faculty should direct that the performance upon, and repairs of, the *Organ* should in future be paid for out of the Parish Rates, that might be a legal objection to the validity of the Faculty, for the ORDINARY has no power to bind the Parish to an expence for an article which is not absolutely necessary, even though the Vestry unanimously wished it. (*Same Case*, 3 Hagg. 7.)—CRIPPS 421; ROGERS 515; WADDILOVE 253, 254.

Nor will the argument hold, that because an *Organ* has been erected by virtue of a Faculty, therefore it *must of necessity* be maintained at the expence of the Parish. In *Jay v. Webber*, a Faculty to confirm the erection of an *Organ*, which had been effected by *voluntary contributions* was granted; but the Court declared that the Faculty bound the Parish to nothing. By granting the Faculty the ORDINARY merely approved of, and confirmed the erection of the *Organ* by voluntary contributions. (3 Hagg. 9).

In the case of *Pearce v. Rector of Clapham*, SIR W. WYNNE said: ‘I do not think that if a Faculty has been obtained for an *Organ*, and if, there being no permanent provision for its support, succeeding Parishioners should not choose to take upon themselves the expence, there is any authority to oblige them to have it played upon, especially if a clause be added, as is often done, that

'the expences should be defrayed by *voluntary contributions*. What consequences would ensue? That the *Organ* would not be played upon. It might remain in its place unperformed upon; and not being essential to Divine Service, I think there is *no duty or authority* in the Ordinary to compel the Parishioners to contribute.' (3 Hagg. 10. 16.). Still, that there is no provision for the future repairs of the *Organ*, or for the permanent *Salary of an Organist*, is not a sufficient argument to stay the issuing of a Faculty for the erection of an *Organ* in a Parish Church. (*ib.* 3 Hagg. 10.).—C. G. PRIDEAUX 200; ROGERS 515; STEPHENS L. 290; *ib.* B. of C. Pr. 365; WADDILOVE, 254.

*Gift of an Organ.*—If an *Organ* be presented to a Parish Church, the permission of the ORDINARY is necessary before it can be erected; and this is conferred by a Faculty. Any objections on the part of the Incumbent, or the Parishioners, may be laid before the Ordinary, and will receive every consideration.

LORD STOWELL, in the case of a Faculty being applied for, to enable the Churchwardens to *accept and erect* an ORGAN, the gift of a Parishioner,—said: 'Although the ORGAN would be a *gift*, still there might be expences arising out of it, as for erecting it, keeping it in order, and for an *Organist*, and as those might fall on the Parish, it might render the consent of the Parishioners generally necessary.' The 'Faculty' for *accepting and erecting* the ORGAN in this case was granted, without a clause against future expences being charged on the Parish, and in which objections of certain of the Parishioners were over-ruled. Of course, in this, as well as in all *Faculties* properly granted, due regard was had to the condition of the Inhabitants, and the general circumstances of the Parish. Inserting a clause in the Faculty that no expence shall fall on the Parish, is discretionary only, and though generally proper, by no means binding. (*Chws. of St John, Margate v. the Parishioners &c.* 1 Hagg. 198—200; also *Jay v. Webber* 3 Hagg. 10.)—BURN I. 374. a; CRIPPS 420; STEPHENS 290; WADDILOVE 253, 254.

MR ROGERS, in quoting this case, says:—'When the Parish is large and the Inhabitants opulent, the Court might be inclined to the grant, if required by a large majority of the Parish, and if capable of being carried into effect without injury to private rights. Therefore, in a case where an offer was made to present an ORGAN to a populous Parish of great public resort, the rental of which was £12,000, the Court pronounced for the 'Faculty' without inserting any clause for provision for an *Organist*, or for exonerating the Parish from the expences incurred in maintaining it. (1 Hagg. 298.).'—*Ecc. L.* 514. See also WADDILOVE 253.

*Parishioners' Consent.*—The consent of the Parishioners is not indispensable to the erection of an *Organ*, nor will it be binding on the Ordinary; the Parishioners may show cause against the granting of a Faculty, and if reasonable and sufficient the Ordinary's decision will be guided by it. The Parishioners'

consent is only *absolutely necessary* when they may be involved in expences.

In the case of the *Churchwardens of St John's Margate v. the Parishioners, &c.*, it was stated by LORD STOWELL:—‘That the consent of the Parishioners to the erection of an Organ is not the only thing material to found the application for a Faculty for that purpose, since the measure may be improper, in consideration of the Parish, or the Church, or private rights may be affected. It may therefore be the duty of the Ordinary to interfere and protect the Parish from its own indiscretion; as if the Parish was small, and the rent of houses high, or there should be other circumstances rendering such an addition to the Church inexpedient.’ (1 Hagg. 200.). The consent of the Parishioners is not indispensably necessary, unless to charge the Parish with an expence for the support of the Ornament after it has been put up. But if there is no such charge incurred, the approbation of the majority of the Parishioners is not necessary, nor their disapprobation binding on the Ordinary. The same doctrine was held by the Court of King’s Bench in *Butterworth v. Walker*, where it was decided—‘That the consent of the Parish is not necessary to the Ordinary’s directing an Organ to be erected in a Church; but the Parish cannot, without their consent, be charged with the expence of erecting or repairing it, or adding new Ornaments. Nor can the consent of the Vestry bind the Parish without immemorial usage. In this case the *Organ* being provided for by *voluntary contributions* a prohibition was denied.’ (3 Burr. 1689).—BURN I. 374. a; CRIPPS 420; STEPHENS L. 290; *ih. B. of C. Pr.* 365; WADDILOVE 253. The Court may refuse the whole Parish joined together, or may grant a Faculty, if it appears necessary, on the petition of one against all the rest. (*Groves v. Rector of Hornsey*, 1 Hagg. Cons. 189.).—CRIPPS 421.

*Property in the Organ.*—When an *Organ* is erected in a Church or Chancel, it becomes the property of the Parish; so that if any injury be done to it, or it be removed, the Churchwardens may bring an Action at Common Law. Thus: ‘If a man take the *Organ* out of the Church, the Churchwardens may have an Action of trespass for it; for the *Organ* belongs to the Parishioners, and not to the Parson.’ (1 ROL. Abr. Chw. (A) 393, pt. 2.) STEPHENS 355. See also *supra* p. 486.

*Removal of an Organ.*—If an ORGAN is a burden to a Parish, or occupies too much room in a Church, it may be removed, but not without a Faculty; nor would this be granted in opposition to the wish of the majority of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled. According to SIR J. NICHOLL, ‘A Faculty for erecting an ORGAN will not enjoin the raising of any rate, and if it should be found a burden, it may be removed altogether by another Faculty; particularly if the removal can be shown to be necessary, or even beneficial for the important object of enabling additional Parishioners to attend Public Worship.’ This, in some measure, gets rid of the hardship and inconvenience that might arise from the want of a clause in the Faculty providing against any expence to which the ORGAN might put the Parish. (*Jay v. Webber*, 3 Hagg. 9.).—BURN I. 374. a; ROGERS 515; WADDILOVE 253.



*Size of the Church* to be considered.—If the Church is not sufficiently capacious for the wants of the population, this in the opinion of the Ordinary will be a bar to the granting of a Faculty for erecting an ORGAN. SIR G. LEE, in the case of *Randall v. Collins*, where it was proved that the Church was already too small for the Inhabitants of the Parish, and that the erection of an *Organ* would decrease the number of the sittings by causing their removal for its admission, *refused* to grant a Faculty, reversing the decree of the Consistory Court. (2 Sir G. Lee 227.).—STEPHENS *L.* 290; *ib. B. of Com. Pr.* 365; WADDILOVE 253.

Many Clergymen will introduce into their Churches, where the erection of a fixed *Organ* would be incompatible, an *Harmonium*, or a *Seraphine*, or perhaps a small *Keyed-Organ*. The last mentioned instrument more nearly approaches to the ancient *Regalls*, which are considered by many the most correct instrumental accompaniment to the Church Services. In these cases, care must be taken that the Instrument be either removed out of the Church once a year at the least, or an entry be made in the Churchwardens' Book, to the effect that such Instrument is merely a loan; otherwise it would, *in strictness*, become Parish property, and a future Churchwarden might refuse to surrender it. A *Barrel-Organ* is sometimes admitted; but on account of the reiterated use of so limited a number of tunes, it soon becomes wearisome and objectionable: still, it is preferable to an ill-regulated orchestra of *Flutes*, *Violoncellos*, '*et id genus omne.*'

With regard to the propriety of admitting *Organs*, or indeed any kind of *Instrumental Music* at all into our Churches, is a question open to much discussion; and in this enquiry a reference to ancient usages will be of material assistance: when the *Organ* was first introduced into Churches is not accurately known.

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723), speaking of *Organs*, says:—'There were no such things in use in the ancient Churches for many ages. *Music* in Churches is as ancient as the Apostles, but *Instrumental Music* not so: for it is now generally agreed by learned men, that the use of *Organs* came into the Church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, anno 1250. For he in his Sums has these words "Our Church does not use *Musical Instruments*, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize." From which our learned MR. GREGORY (in his *Disc. on Sing.*

'*Nic. Creed.* Inter Op. Pos. p. 51.) concludes, that there was no Ecclesiastical use of *Organs* in his time. And the same inference is made by CAJETAN, and NAVARRE among the Romish writers. MR. WHARTON also has observed, that MARINUS SANCTUS, who lived about the year 1290, was the first that brought the use of *wind Organs* into Churches, whence he was surnamed *Turcellus*, which is the name for an *Organ* in the Italian tongue. And about this time DURANDUS, in his *Rationale*, takes notice of them as received in the Church, and he is the first author, MR. GREGORY thinks, that so takes notice of them. The use of the instrument indeed is much ancients, but not in Church Service; the not attending to which distinction is the thing that imposes upon many writers. In the East, the Instrument was always in use in the Emperors' courts, perhaps from the time of JULIAN, who has an Epigram giving a handsome description of it. But in the Western parts, the Instrument was not so much as known till the 8th century. For the first *Organ* that was ever seen in France, was one sent as a present to king PEPIN by CONSTANTINUS COPRONYMUS, the Greek Emperor, anno 766, as BONA himself shews....But now it was only used in princes' courts, and not yet brought into Churches. Nor was it ever received into the Greek Churches....But DURANDUS contends for their antiquity both in the Greek and Western Churches, and offers to prove it, but with ill success. First from JULIANUS HALICARNASSENSIS, a Greek writer, anno 510, whom he makes to say, that *Organs* were used in the Church in his time....(but) it is plain, he speaks of the Jewish temple....Next, for the Latin Church he urges the common opinion, which ascribes the invention of them to Pope VITALIAN, anno 660. But his authorities....are little to be regarded against clear evidences to the contrary. That which some urge out of CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS I shall not answer as SUICERUS does (who, with HOSPINIAN and some others, wholly decrying the use of *Instrumental Music* in Christian Churches, says, it is an interpolation and corruption of that ancient author), but only observe, that he speaks not of what was then in use in Christian Churches, but of what might lawfully be used by any private Christians, if they were disposed to use it. Which rather argues, that *Instrumental Music*, the lute and harp, of which he speaks, was not in use in the public Churches. The same may be gathered from the words of St Chrysostom, &c.....So that there being no use of *Organs* till the 12th century, I could not speak of them as utensils of the ancient churches.'—*Antiq. of Christian Church*. viii. 7. § 14.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) remarks:—'Nor does the use of *Musical Instruments* in the singing of Psalms appear to be less ancient than the custom itself of singing them.'....(After referring to the Jewish practices in the Temple, he adds:—)....'And this has been the constant practice of the Church, in most ages, as well since, as before the coming of Christ. When *Organs* were first brought into use, is not clearly known; but we find it recorded that about the year 766, CONSTANTINUS COPRONYMUS, Emperor of Constantinople, sent a present of an *Organ* to king PEPIN of France: and it is certain that the use of them has been very common now for several hundred of years, DURAND mentioning them several times in his book, but giving no intimation of their novelty in Divine Service.' (p. 130).—*Rat. Ill. of Book of Com. Prayer*.

DR. HOOK says:—‘There is an epigram of JULIAN the Apostate, which describes an *Organ* exactly: an *Organ* is spoken of by CASSIODORUS, A. D. 514; and by AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS (l. XIV. c. 6.). BELLARMINE says, that this instrument was first used in Churches, A. D. 660.; Cardinal CAJETAN says that it was not used in the primitive Church, and gives this as a reason why it is not used in the Pope’s Chapel. HOSPINIAN, an ultra-Protestant writer, contends against the use of the *Organ* on the authority of St Paul (1 Cor. xiv.)....According to HOSPINIAN it was in the Pontificate of SEXTUS IV. that *Pedals* were introduced. BINGHAM quotes a passage from THOMAS AQUINAS, to shew that *Instrumental Music* was not considered canonical in his time, A. D. 1250; but when we consider the authorities referred to above, it seems that THOMAS AQUINAS could only have been alluding to a local custom; certainly GERVAS, a monk of Cantherbury, A. D. 1210, mentions that *Organs* were introduced 100 years before his time; and DR. BURNEY mentions a Missal of the 10th or 11th century, among the Barbarini MSS. at Rome, where an *Organ* is alluded to. The first *Organ* seen in the West was that sent to king PEPIN, A. D. 757. We have shewn above, that *Organs* were used before that time in the East. The question here is, when were they introduced into the Church? and we should venture to conjecture that *they were introduced into the Church in the 10th century*, and were gradually improved until they arrived at their present perfection.’ (p. 448.)—*Church Dict. Art. “ORGAN.”*

The REV. J. E. RIDDLE observes:—‘These Instruments of Music were introduced into the Christian Church about the 9th century. They were unknown alike to the early Church, and to all the ancients....But these instruments were of a size and construction altogether inferior to the modern *Organ*.’....(The author here refers to the original reeds or pipes of PAN, and to the water *Organ* (*Organum hydraulicum*) of ARCHIMEDES, and thus proceeds:—) ‘The large *wind Organ* was known, however, long before it was introduced into the Churches of the West. It appears, from the testimony of AUGUSTIN and others, that it was known in Africa and Spain, as early as the 5th and 6th centuries. The first *Organ* used in a Church was one which was received by Charlemagne as a present from the Emperor CONSTANTINE MICHAEL. In the latter end of the 15th century, the number of Pipes was increased, and the Pedal and Stops were added. Many improvements were made in the course of the 16th century. In the East, *Organs* were never approved as instruments of sacred music; nor did the use of them continue without opposition in the West.’ (p. 735.)—*Christian Antiq.*

The REV. W. GILSON HUMPHRY, referring to BINGHAM, writes:—‘For the use of *Musical Instruments* in the Church there was ample precedent in the service of the Temple....But it appears that the Christian Church for several centuries did not admit any musical accompaniment in her public devotions....Towards the end of the 13th century, however, musical Instruments were generally used in Churches, as we may conclude from the frequent mention made of them by DURANDUS, a Liturgical writer of that time (1286 A. D.)....(After speaking of the *Organ* sent to PEPIN at the date, 660 A. D., he adds:—)....‘The invention

'of a wind instrument of this kind is attributed to CTESIBIUS, an eminent mathematician of Alexandria, who lived in the reign of PROLEMY EUGERGETES. The name *Organ* was given by the Greeks to musical instruments of any kind, as you may see from the Septuagint Version of *Amos* v. 23, in a passage quoted by the Fathers as an authority against instrumental Church music in 'general.' (p. 122.)—*On the Book of Common Prayer*.

Such are the opinions with respect to the antiquity of the *Organ*, and the introduction into our Churches of *Instrumental Music*.

With regard to the modern use of the *Organ*, we shall still find a difference of opinion, particularly with relation to its size, and position.

In 1559. In one of the *Injunctions* of Elizabeth we read:—  
 'Because in divers Collegiate, and also some Parish Churches, heretofore there have been livings appointed for the maintenance of men and children to use Singing in the Church, by means whereof the laudable service of Music hath been had in estimation, and preserved in knowledge; the Queen's Majesty neither meaning in any wise the decay of any thing, that might conveniently tend to the use and continuance of the said science, neither to have the same in any part so abused in the Church, that thereby the Common Prayer should be the worse understood of the hearers, willeth and commandeth, that first no alterations be made of such assignments of living, as heretofore hath been appointed to the use of *Singing or Music* in the Church, but that the same so remain. And that there be a modest and distinct Song so used in all parts of the Common Prayers in the Church, that the same may be as plainly understood, as if it were read without singing; and yet nevertheless for the comforting of such that delight in *Music*, it may be permitted, that in the beginning, or in the end of the Common Prayers, either at Morning or Evening, there may be sung an Hymn, or such like Song to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and Music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of Hymn may be understood and perceived.'—(CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* 1. 196.). HEYLYN adds, when quoting this Injunction:—  
 "According to which order, as *plain song* was retained in most Parish Churches for the daily Psalms, so in her own Chapels, and in the quire of all Cathedrals and some Colleges, the Hymns were sung after a more melodious manner, with *Organs* commonly, and sometimes with *other Musical Instruments*, as the solemnity required."—*Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S. II. 300.

In 1562. BP BURNET informs us, there was a discussion in Convocation respecting the removal of *Organs* in consequence of their use having been objected to (III. 454.)....GRINDAL and HORN, also write in their Letters to BULLINGER, that they 'did not approve of that *figured Music*, together with the use of *Organs*, that was continued in Cathedrals.' (III. 472.)—*Hist. of Ref.* Coll. No. 83. (Nares' Ed.).

BP. JEREMY TAYLOR (*ob.* 1667.) does not appear to advocate *Instrumental Music* in Churches; he says:—‘The use of *Musical Instruments* may also add some little advantages to Singing, but ‘they are more apt to change religion into air and fancies, and ‘take off some of its simplicity, and are not so fitted for edification....*Instruments* may guide the voice, and so they may be ‘used.’—*Doctor Dubit.* B. III. c. 4. rule XX. §. 11.

ABP. SECKER (*ob.* 1768.), commenting upon the words, ‘*trumpets* ‘also and *shawms*,’ in *Ps.* xcvi. 7, says:—‘Another instrument of ‘wind Musick, which in our Bible is called a *cornet*; whence we ‘may conclude, if it needed proof, that *Musical Instruments* are ‘*lawful in Christian worship*,’ (quoted in MANT’S *Com. Pr.* p. 46. note f.). . . . Again:—‘*Instruments of Music in Divine Service* are ‘*certainly lawful*, else they had not been appointed in the Jewish, ‘or permitted in the ancient Christian Church, or described in the ‘*Revelation*,’ as accompanying the praises of the Blessed above.’ (*ibid.* p. 20. Note i.).

BP. HORNE (*ob.* 1732.), in his comments on *Ps.* cl. 3—5, speaks of the Hebrews using several sorts of *Musical Instruments*, and adds:—‘Thus much is clear, that the people of God are enjoined to ‘use *all the various kinds of them*, in the performance of their ‘Divine Services. And why should they not be so used under the ‘Gospel....the custom was not introduced by the Law, nor ‘abolished with it. Well-regulated Musick, if ever it had the ‘power of calming the passions, if ever it enlivened and exalted the ‘affections of men in the Worship of God, (purposes for which it ‘was formerly employed), doubtless hath still the same power, and ‘can still afford the same aids to devotion.’ (After referring to *Rev.* xiv. 2; he adds:—)....‘Why *Instrumental Musick* should be ‘abolished as a legal ceremony, and *Vocal Musick*, which was as ‘much so, should be retained, no good reason can be assigned.\* ‘*Sacred Musick*, under proper regulations, removes the hindrances ‘of our devotion, cures the distraction of our thoughts, and ‘banishes weariness from our minds. It adds solemnity to the ‘publick Service, raises all the devout passions in the soul, and ‘causes our duty to become our delight.’—*Com. on Book of Psalms.* Vol. II. 472. pub. by “Society For Prom. Christian Knowledge;” (also quoted in MANT’S *Book of Com. Prayer*, p. 661. note s.).

Of later date we have the following opinions.

The REV. W. BATES states that the first *Organ*, that was known in the West, was the one ‘sent to PEPIN, king of France, ‘about A. D. 776: but SUNATUS is supposed to have been the first ‘who introduced them, as now used, into Churches about A. D. 1312.

---

\* HOOKER makes a similar remark in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, thus:—‘They which, under the pretence of the law ceremonial ‘abrogated, require the abrogation of *Instrumental Music*, ap- ‘proving, nevertheless, the use of *Vocal melody* to remain, must ‘shew some reason wherefore the one should be thought a legal ‘ceremony, and not the other.’—(*Book.* V. *Chap.* xxxviii.)

'*Rigols*,\* or *Regalls*, were also used in Churches.' (p. 323.)—*Lectures on Christian Antiq.*

THE REV. R. HART speaks of 'a *Minstrels' Gallery*, forming a 'sort of orchestra for the accommodation of *vocal and instrumental performers*, though not uncommon in Continental Churches, is 'very rarely met with in this country. There is a gallery of this 'sort over the Altar-Screen at Chichester Cathedral, and another, 'much more remarkable, near the middle of the north side of the 'Choir of Exeter Cathedral. It is supported upon thirteen pillars, 'between every two of which, in a niched recess, there is a 'sculptured representation of an Angel playing upon some musical 'instrument. Among these we observe the cittern, bagpipe, harp, 'violin, pipe, tambourine, &c. The roof of Outwell Church, 'Norfolk, and the *Minstrels' column* at Beverley, also exhibit a 'great variety of *Musical Instruments* anciently used in our 'Churches, independently of the *Organ*, and the *Regalls*, which was 'a small portable Organ, having one row of pipes giving the treble 'notes, the same number of keys, and a small pair of bellows moved 'with the left hand.' (p. 243.)—*Ecl. Records.*

DR. HOOK, referring to the time of the Reformation, says:— '*Organs* were considered as among the vilest remnants of Popery 'by all the more enthusiastic partisans of Protestantism. And by 'those who carried out the principles of ultra-Protestantism to 'their legitimate extent at the Great Rebellion, *Organs* were so 'generally demolished, that scarcely an instrument of the kind 'could be found in England at the Restoration; and foreigners 'were brought over to play on those which were then erected. It 'is satisfactory to see such prejudices wearing away. We now 'find those whose horror at fasting or at self-denials, or at turning 'to the east in prayer, or at preaching in a Surplice as the 'Prayer-Book directs, or at bowing to the Altar, or at preferring 'prayer to preaching, &c., is unfeigned, and who see in these 'observances nothing but Popery, expending large sums of money 'to erect *Organs*, which are now heard to sound in the very 'Meeting-Houses. We believe that the Kirk of Scotland is alone 'consistent in this respect, and true to the principles of their ultra- 'Protestant forefathers; the members of that establishment do not 'even yet tolerate what at the Reformation was called "a squeaking abomination." (p. 449.)—*Church Dict. Art. "ORGAN."*

THE REV. J. JEBB, speaking of the *position* of the Organ, says:—'The *Organ* was placed on one side of the Choir, generally 'the north, and towards the east end. GERVAIS relates that in the

---

\* By the use of the term *Rigols*, the portable keyed Organ above alluded to must not be confounded with an ancient instrument of the same name described by DR. BUSBY, in his *Dictionary of Music* (p. 241.), as 'consisting of several sticks placed by the side 'of each other, but separated by beads. It was performed upon 'by being struck with a ball fixed at the end of a stick.' The more correct orthography of the name of the small Organ is *Regalls*, or *Regal*. See also BARR'S *Anglican Church Architecture*, p. 68.

'12th century such was its position in Canterbury Cathedral, on the north side over the transept arch. This seems to have been universal throughout Europe....(After mentioning various examples, he adds:—). 'The present usual position over the Choir-Screen does not appear to have been general till the Restoration: a contrivance which in Parish Churches completely blocks out the Chancel (p. 197.)....The *Organ* ought never in any instance to stand over the Choir-Screen. This position is modern and never contemplated by the original architects of our Churches.... There is a less objectionable practice adopted in many Collegiate Churches abroad of placing the *Organ* over the great West door. However this has the bad effect of blocking up in part the Western Window. This custom is not older than the 17th century, when Holland was seized with the mania of building gigantic and noisy *Organs*. I must avow an utter distaste for these enormous music-mills. Their barbarous crash is more fit for Nebuchadnezzar's festival, than for that sweet and grave accompaniment for which our best Cathedral *Organs* were fully sufficient....The English Cathedral *Orgau*, it should be remembered, is intended to be an accompaniment of a Choir, not a vehicle for Voluntaries or Concertos, as abroad, where its Choral use is generally subordinate. Of late the *Organ* has been restored to its ancient position (*on the side of the Choir*) in the Cathedral of Canterbury, the Parish Church of Leeds, and the Temple Church in London. (p. 202-3.)....In the Roman Choirs, though the regular Clerical members still retain their proper places in their stalls, the secularity of more modern times has introduced *hired laymen* in addition, mere stipendiaries, and often *theatrical Singers*, into a gallery, to execute that operatic style of Music, which abroad has very much superseded the school of Palestrina and Allegri....but as our Church Music and Church Singers are not yet so degenerated, there is no reason why we should copy this bad example....*Hired Women Singers* ought never to be suffered in the House of God. They may join of course in the Music, as private individuals. (p. 204.)....The *Organ* is of daily use in all regular English Choirs. Abroad, it is not in general used except on Festivals and their Eves: the plain chant being kept up without the *Organ*. It is unknown to the Greek Church. In the Western it was *employed first about the 9th century*, earlier than some historians have supposed. It ought to be remembered, that one of the greatest improvements in the *Organ*, that of the swell, was made by an English artist. (p. 309.)....It remains to observe, that according to the universal, at least very general custom of Europe, the *Organ* is silent during the whole of *'Passion Week*, and in some Cathedrals, during *Wednesdays* and *'Fridays in Lent.'* (p. 313.)—*Choral Service.*

DR. MARKLAND, speaking of the *Singers*, observes:—'Instead of bringing the *Singers* amongst the Congregation, so that they may form a portion of it, we find occasionally an Orchestra, consisting, though improperly, of persons of *both Sexes*, mere instruments, hired at Salaries, perched in an *Organ loft*, perfectly independent of, and feeling themselves no part of the Congregation, singing *for* or *to* them, but not *with* them....Or, in the place of this most *un-ecclesiastical Choir*, we listen to a large number of children, who sing at the utmost height of their

'voices; and to these trebles, strained to their highest pitch, an *Organ* far too powerful is perhaps united. What can be more fatal to a sense of devotion? The *Organ* and Choir, are to lead, not to drown the voices of the Congregation.' (p. 41.).—*Reverence Due to Holy Places.*

In the INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA it is stated that:—'An *Organ* ought to be small, as it is needed in order to sustain, not to drown, the voices. This *Organ* (the example) will stand on the ground.'—PLATE 69.

In the *Tract* a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS" we find the remark:—'I hope your *Organ*, if you have one, is in the right place, that is at the West end: to have it over the Altar itself, or between the Chancel and Nave so as to block off the one from the other, is not to be borne. . . . The transept arch is not a good place for it, as well for other reasons, as that it destroys the effect of the four arms of the Cross. The *Organ* ought to stand upon the floor; both because no gallery at all ought to be allowed in a Church, and because it need not then bide any window. The sound is not hurt by its being placed on the ground. You will not, I dare say, be of those who would let the *Organ* go to decay, or remain out of tune, because some evil-minded people may say that it does not fall under the necessary repairs of the Church.' (p. 12.).—PART II. Pub. by the "*Ecclesiological Society.*"

In a *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," we read:—'*Organs* should never be placed in lofty galleries blocking up the Belfry-Arch, and destroying the proper effect and proportions of a Church by their unwieldy size and conspicuous prominence. A subordinate Instrument in the performance of the Services, it should not, as it now is, be looked upon as the great object of attraction and interest. For this reason it should be of moderate size, and placed either upon the ground at the west end of one of the aisles, or raised on a low platform. In every position in which it can be placed a modern *Organ* is an encumbrance; and we can only advise in a question of much difficulty, that which appears to us the least objectionable course.' (p. 25).—3rd. Ed. Published by the Cambridge Camden Society.

### [The Organist.]

His Appointment, and Salary.

THE Appointment of an ORGANIST usually involves by courtesy, if not by right, on the source from which his *Salary* is derived; unless the Income proceeds from an endowment, and the trust-deed places the election in some one or more individuals specifically mentioned. Possibly, immemorial custom reposes it in a Parish Vestry, or elsewhere. When



the *Salary* is supplied by voluntary subscriptions, the Incumbent, from his position, and particularly if he should be the largest contributor, has usually the most influential voice in the Appointment of the *Organist*; and the Parishioners are for the most part content to rely on his judgment and experience. Should the *Salary* not be provided by voluntary contributions, nor be derived from endowment, it frequently happens that the payment of the *Organist* is secured out of the *Pew-rents* where such exist. There are instances however where this expence is defrayed by the *Church-rate*, with the consent of the majority of the Parishioners, and the election of the *Organist* is in consequence determined by the Parish Vestry, thus :—

LORD STOWELL (*Sir W. Scott*) said in the Burton-on-Trent case (A. D. 1790):—‘ I think the *Churchwardens* have a right, with ‘ the consent and approbation of the Vestry Meeting legally called, ‘ to pay the *Salary of the Organist*, and to charge it in their ‘ accounts, notwithstanding the objections of a very inconsiderable\* ‘ minority; and I think that they would be supported by Courts of ‘ Law, both temporal and Ecclesiastical, in so doing. I advise ‘ that this assessment may be made with the consent of the Vestry, ‘ in the way of a *Church-Rate*, and that those who refuse to pay the ‘ Rate be sued for it in the Ecclesiastical Court.’—BURN I. 374 a; STEPHENS L. 291; WADDILOVE 254. n.

It is very doubtful whether the proceeding thus recommended by LORD STOWELL would meet with quiet acquiescence in these times; and we may question indeed if there are any Churchwardens now to be found possessed of sufficient energy and resolution to hazard the experiment. These Church Officers are for the most part compelled by the scrutiny, and pressure of Parish Vestries, rigidly to confine their expenditure of the Church-Rate to the repairs of the fabric, and the supply of such things only as are *absolutely* and *legally* necessary for the conduct of Divine Service.

The following later decision will confirm this observation with respect to the payment of the *Organist*.

---

\* DR. WADDILOVE, in his *Digest of Eccl. Cases*, writes, ‘ considerable.’

MR JUSTICE PATTESON, in his judgment in the case of *Reg. v. The Vicar &c. of St Stephen's, Coleman-Street*,—which was an application to the Court of Queen's Bench for a mandamus to the Vicar, Churchwardens, and Parishioners of St Stephens to proceed to the election of an *Organist*, or to admit *Miss Le Cren*,—decided, that the Parishioners were not bound to supply an *Organist*, although it had been the constant usage of the Parish to elect one, and a sum had been included in the Church-Rate for his *Salary*. 'On 'looking at the Authorities,' he said, 'I cannot find any which go 'the length of saying that I can issue such a writ for the election 'of an *Organist*.' (After referring to the decision of LORD STOWELL in the case of the *Chvs. of St John's, Margate v. the Parishioners &c.* already given, he proceeded:—). 'I therefore think it is 'impossible that a *mandamus* should go to the Inhabitants generally, to elect an *Organist*.... It is true, that there has been from 'time to time a vote for the *expences of the Organist out of the 'Church-Rate*; but I see nothing to prevent the Parishioners 'from rescinding their appointment of *Organist*, and determining 'for the future to have none.' (14 L. J. 34; 2 D. & L. 571.)—C. G. PRIDEAUX 201. n; STEPHENS L. 645.

So that where a Parish may be desirous of getting rid of the expence of an *Organist*, the Parishioners may discharge him according to the regular course, and shut up the *Organ*.

### [The Control over the Organist,]

The Singers, and the Singing.

THE control over the *Organ*, and over the *Singers* &c. is legally vested in the OFFICIATING MINISTER, subject to the interference of the Ordinary. This was decided in the Ecclesiastical Courts in the case of *Hutchins v. Denziloe*, where the Churchwardens were proceeded against by the OFFICIATING MINISTER for *obstructing the Singing of the children of the Ward, accompanied by the Organ*. The Articles having been admitted by the Churchwardens, the Court, after giving a summary of the history and introduction of Music into our Church Service, decided that the *Churchwardens had illegally interfered*: thus—  
'The Minister has the right of directing the Service, *e. g.* when the 'ORGAN shall and shall not play, and when Children shall and 'shall not chant, though the ORGANIST is paid, and the Children 'managed by the Churchwardens.' (3 Phill. 90; 1 Hagg. Con. 175.). 'They must complain to the Ordinary, if he introduces

'irregularity into the Service.' (*Wilson v. Macmath*, 3 B. & A. 250.). The expediency of the practice of Chanting or Singing in any particular Church is for the Ordinary to determine; the Ecclesiastical Court can only judge of its legality.—*BURN* l. 374. b; *STEPHENS* L. 290. 344; *ib. B. of C. Pr.* 365; *WADDILOVE* 118. 301; see also *supra* p. 432.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*), when referring to this case, says:—'SIR WM. SCOTT in his judgment....considers the discretion of a Minister, who had introduced the *chanting* a part of the Service into a Parochial Church, as *questionable*; but the judgment expressly declares that there is nothing in point of law to prevent his so doing, and that any interference or countermand by the Churchwardens is illegal and punishable: and as the Minister is to direct, at his discretion, what parts of the Service are to be sung, and to exercise a general superintendence in such matters, it follows that he may direct by whom the Singing or Chanting are to be principally performed, whether it is to be instrumental, or vocal only, and, in fact, to make any new orders, or regulations relating thereto as he may think fit; but subject to the general controlling power of the Ordinary; to whom, consequently, the Churchwardens, or Parishioners, or any of them who may feel aggrieved by such new orders and regulations, ought to address their complaint. It follows therefore, from what is here said, that the appointment or dismissal of Singers, or Instrumental Performers, in the Church rests entirely with the Minister, who might dismiss them individually, or as a body, appoint a different method, or prohibit Singing altogether, if he thought proper; subject, however, as we have already observed. And if any after dismissal should persist, nevertheless, in continuing to perform or sing as before, it is presumed they would be liable to be punished under the Statute, Will. III.\* as wilful disturbers of the Congregation.' (p. 603.)—*Laws Rel. to Church and Clergy*.

MR. ROGERS (*Barrister-at-Law*) quotes the same judgment of SIR WM. SCOTT, but with a slight verbal difference; thus:—'It was decided that although by general usage *Chanting* parts of the Service is limited to Cathedrals, yet, in point of law, there was nothing to prevent the Singing or *Chanting* a part of the Service in a Parochial Church; a Clergyman, therefore, who had directed it to be done, had been guilty of nothing irregular, though the discretion of such an order might perhaps be *questionable*, but an interference and countermand by the Churchwardens was *illegal*, and *punishable*.' (p. 834.)—*Ecc. Law*.

From the above opinions it is evident, that the Singing, Chanting, and the introduction of *Instrumental Music* into any part of Divine Service, are entirely dependent upon the discretion of the Minister, who is, however, restrained from indulging any unbecoming fancies or peculiarities which might prove

---

\* See this Statute quoted at page 437 *supra*, under 'DISTURBING THE SERVICES.'

offensive to the religious feelings of his Congregation by their power of appeal to the Ordinary. In admitting *Flutes*, *Violins*, and instruments of the like kind, into a Church, the Incumbent should exercise the greatest caution. These may have been once sanctioned, but they are now considered decidedly objectionable, and opposed to all devotional feeling, and Ecclesiastical propriety; and not only so, but the indulgence of this taste would entail upon the Minister perpetual anxiety and annoyance—unless the instrumental choir be remarkably well-regulated, and under the strictest discipline. If otherwise, the Minister would find, that not only the selection of the tunes, but, in fact, that the whole character of the instrumental accompaniment would be completely out of his control; since the arrangement and execution of the music would of necessity be dependent upon the practice and proficiency of the performers.

### *The Parish-Chest.*

THE necessity of providing a *Parish-Chest* for the safe keeping of the REGISTERS of *Baptisms*, *Marriages*, and *Burials*, was originally imposed by the Injunctions of Edward VI, and of Elizabeth; and subsequently by CANON 70 (of 1603-4), which last is still binding upon us at this day, except where it may have been superseded by the Statute Law. The provisions of this CANON which have respect to the *Parish-Chest* are however among those that have been set aside by later enactments, as we have fully shewn when treating of '*Registers*' in previous pages, and to which we must refer our Readers for the present state of the Law on this subject.

It will be well, perhaps, in this place to state the ancient usage. In CANON 70, when speaking of the *Registers* of Baptisms &c., it is directed:—

'...And for the safe keeping of the said Book, the Church-wardens at the charge of the Parish, shall provide one sure *Coffer*, with three locks and keys; whereof the one to remain

‘with the Minister, and the other two with the Churchwardens severally; so that neither the Minister without the two Churchwardens, nor the Churchwardens without the Minister, shall at any time take that Book out of the said *Coffer*.’—CANON 70.

\* \* This CANON is derived almost verbatim from an *Injunction* of Edward VIth’s (of 1547), which was repeated by Elizabeth in 1559. (CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* I. 11. 49. 183.)

In the *Constitutions* of 1597 it was ordered:—‘*Neque vero in unius cujusquam custodia librum illum, sed in Cista publica, eaque trifariam obserata reservandum putamus, ita ut neque sine Ministro Gardiani, nec sine utrisque Gardianis Minister quicquam possit innovare.*’ (p. 256.).—SPARROW’S *Collection*.

By the *Statute Law* it is now ordered that the *Parish Register Books* shall be in the custody of the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister,—

‘...and shall be by him safely and securely kept in a dry well painted *iron chest*, to be provided and repaired, as occasion may require, at the expence of the Parish or Chapelry, and which said *Chest* containing the said Books shall be constantly kept locked in some dry, safe, and secure place within the usual place of residence of such Rector, Vicar, Curate or other Officiating Minister (if resident within the Parish or Chapelry), or in the Parish Church or Chapel.’—52 *Geo. III. c.* 146. s. 5. (Fully quoted at page 522. *supra*.)

The inconvenience of the practice enjoined in the CANON is thus described by ARCHDEACON SHARP;—

‘The provision of a “*Chest or Coffer* with three locks and keys,” at the charges of the Parish belongs to the Churchwardens. And consequently the Minister is not answerable for any failure here; or any failure of what depends upon such a *Coffer*, and the Register being so deposited in it...The two principal inconveniences I have my eye upon are these: 1st, that the Registers thus kept in *Coffers* are frequently in danger of being damaged and corrupted with the damps and moisture which are often found, in our Churches, to be incurable....And 2dly, the keeping them as the CANON directs, makes them in great measure useless to another end, for which they are kept for the benefit of the present times; viz. the granting Certificates out of them, from time to time, to such persons as desire them and are concerned in them. For if these transcripts could only be made and attested at the times appointed in the CANON for the Book to be taken out of the *Chest*, or at least not otherwise than in the presence both of the Minister and Churchwardens, I need not say what difficulties must arise to the parties who apply for copies out of the *Register*. And therefore custom hath obtained for keeping these Books in places assigned either by joint consent of the Minister and Churchwardens, or by the Minister alone, where they may be consulted with convenience and without delay; and use and prescription upon this convenience have brought the Registers almost solely into the possession and custody of the Ministers, which,

'though not so agreeable to the contents of the CANON, suits mighty well with the Title of it.' (p. 258.).—*On the Rubric and Canons.* (A. D. 1749.).

Where the *ancient Chest* is still in existence, it should be carefully preserved, if not on account of its venerable antiquity, yet for the usefulness to which it might be even now applied.

In the INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA we read:—'Even now, a *Chest* forms a very useful and becoming part of the furniture of the Church. It may serve to contain the Church-Plate, Vestments, Service-Books, and Papers pertaining to the fabric or the Parish.'—PLATES 50—52.

### *The Pulpit.*

The *Pulpit* of modern times appears, like the Lectern, to be an offspring of the ancient '*Ambo*'; which has been already described in our discussion upon the *Lectern* (in page 647). We would therefore refer our Readers to the remarks we there made, should they wish to trace the *Pulpit* up to its original. In this place we will proceed at once to consider the legal and Canonical requirements connected with the subject. The use of the *Pulpit* is enjoined upon us by the 83rd CANON (of 1603-4), in which also the charges of its construction and repair are laid upon the Parishioners. The CANON is as follows:—

'The Churchwardens, or Questmen, at the common charge of the Parishioners in every Church, shall provide a comely and decent *Pulpit* to be set in a *convenient place within the same* by the discretion of the Ordinary of the place, if any question do arise, and to be there seemly kept for the preaching of God's Word.'—CANON 83.

According to these directions the *Pulpit* is to be placed within the Church—not in the Chancel;—and to occupy a '*convenient*' position, i. e. so as the majority of the Congregation may best see and hear the Preacher.

The *Pulpit* is only once alluded to in the *Rubrics* of the LITURGY; and this but incidentally. The *Rubric* referred to is at the beginning of the 'COMMINATION-SERVICE,' and thus reads:—

¶ 'After Morning Prayer, the Litany ended according to 'the accustomed manner, the Priest shall, in the Reading-Pew, 'or PULPIT, say,' (1662).—Present Book of Common Prayer.

In the four preceding Liturgies the last clause of this *Rubric* ran:—

'....in the accustomed manner; which ended, the Priest 'shall go into the Pulpit, and say thus.' (1549-52-59-1604).—KEELING, 346-7.

The generality of writers on Ecclesiastical Law merely quote the 83rd CANON as respects this question. Several, however, cite in addition the following passage from AYLIFFE's *Parergon* (21), in proof of the *Pulpit* being of modern introduction:—

'In ancient times the Bishops preached standing upon the *steps* 'of the Altar; afterwards it was found more convenient to have 'Pulpits erected for that purpose.'—(BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 368; ROGER'S *Eccl. L.* 154; STEER'S *Par. Law.* Clivo 34; STEPHEN'S *Laws Rel. to the Clergy.* 291.).

The *Pulpit*, as a distinct place for preaching, is supposed to have been introduced into our Reformed Churches about the time of the appearance of the *First LITURGY*, A. D. 1549, as will be presently seen. Previously, *Sermons* were delivered from the *Steps* of the Altar, as AYLIFFE observes; and, in some instances, from one or other of the elevated structures from which the Scriptures were usually read, such as the *Ambo*, *Lectern*, or the *Rood-Loft*.

With regard to the *style* and *material* of the PULPIT, these points are not prescribed by any Ecclesiastical authority; but they generally accord with the architecture of the Church, and the character of the internal fittings; although with respect to their ornament, they are sometimes dependent upon the wealth of the Parish, the liberality of the Incumbent, or the taste of the Churchwardens—subject in this last instance, by courtesy, to the judgment of the Minister. The *place* of the Pulpit, as the CANON directs, is to be 'convenient;' this point therefore must be regulated by circumstances, and the peculiar structure of the Church: the more usual position is against the *north side* of the Chancel Arch.

The *Pulpit* is 'exclusively the right of the Parson of the Parish, and the Churchwardens are punishable if they shut the Door against him, and his consent is necessary to a stranger preaching.' (*Chws. of St. Bartholomew's case*. 3 Salk. 87; 12 Mod. 433.) Lord Chief Justice MANSFIELD also said in *Rex. v. Bp of London* (case of *St Luke's, Chelsea*)—'No person can use the Pulpit of another unless he consents.' (13. East. 419; 3 Salk. 87).—BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* ii. 398; G. H. H. OLIPHANT'S *Law of Ch. Orn.* 37. (See also *supra* p. 201: where this question is more fully discussed).

We may now offer a few historical evidences, and Ecclesiastical opinions, illustrative of the origin and position of this piece of Church furniture.

In 1547. In the *Injunctions* of Edward VI. it is ordered:—'That the Churchwardens at the common charge of the Parishioners in every Church shall provide a comely and honest PULPIT to be set in a convenient place within the same, for the preaching of God's Word.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 17.

In the same year ABP. CRANMER inquires in his Visitation Articles:—'Whether they have not every Holy-day, when they have no Sermon, immediately after the Gospel, openly, plainly and distinctly, recited to the Parishioners in the *Pulpit* the "Paternoster," the "Creed," and the "Ten-Commandments" in English.'—(*ib.* 43.)....'Item, Whether within every Church be that ministereth hath read, or caused to be read, the Epistle and Gospel in English, and not in Latin, either in the *Pulpit*, or some other meet place, so as the people may hear the same.'—(*ib.* 45.)....'Item, Whether the Churches, *Pulpits*, and other necessities appertaining to the same be sufficiently repaired.'—(*ib.* 50.)

Previous to the issuing of this Order it is supposed that when the *Pulpit* is spoken of, the *Rood-loft* is implied, see *Note of ARCHDEACON HARRISON*, quoted *supra* (p. 649.)

In 1559, there was added to this inquiry the following clause—'if they be not in whose default the same is?'—(*ib.* 214.)

In 1550. BP. RIDLEY inquires in his Visitation Articles issued through his diocese of London:—'Whether your Church be kept in due and lawful reparation, and whether there be a comely *Pulpit* set up in the same?'—(*ib.* 81.)

In 1559. Queen ELIZABETH in her *Injunctions* repeats that of Edward VI. already given, adding however the words following in Italics:—'....a comely and honest PULPIT to be set in a "convenient place" within the same, and to be there seemly kept for the preaching of God's Word.'—(*ib.* 189.)

\* \* These *Injunctions* of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth are evidently the originals of our present 83rd CANON.

In 1569. ABP. PARKER inquires in his Visitation Articles:—'Whether you have in youre paryshe Churches all things necessary and requisite for Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, specially....a convenient *Pulpit* wel placed.'—(*ib.* 320.)



\* \* The above *Injunctions* will be also found in SPARROW'S *Coll.* pp. 10. 26. 28. 32. 38. 74. 180.

In 1571. The CANONS of that year enjoin upon Churchwardens :—' *Æditui curabunt. . . . Suggestum commodum, unde cœlestis doctrina publicetur.*'—SPARROW'S *Coll.* 235.

The above quotations seem to remove all doubt as to the question. Upon whom rests the responsibility of providing and repairing the *Pulpit*? We will now annex a few opinions :

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723), after discussing the origin of the *Ambo* (as already quoted in *page* 650), thus proceeds with respect to the *Pulpit* :—' BONA thinks the Bishop and Presbyters here (in the *Ambo*) also made their Sermons to the people. (*Per. Lit.* II. 6. n. 3.). For which he cites PRUDENTIUS, and SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, from whose words he further concludes, that the *Ambo* was sometimes called *Ara*, or Altar. But this observation seems to be founded on a mistake. For the Bishops anciently did not use to preach from the *Ambo*, but more commonly from the *rising steps of the Altar*, as VALESIIUS shows that the custom continued in France to the time of King CHILDEBERT. And, therefore, both SOCRATES (VI. c. 5.), and SOZOMEN (VIII. c. 5.), seem to speak of CHRYSOSTOM'S preaching in the *Ambo* as an unusual thing; but he did it for conveniency, SOCRATES says, that he might be better heard by the people. We cannot hence, therefore, conclude, that the *Ambo* was the ordinary place of preaching, but rather the *Altar*. . . . Yet in Africa ST AUSTIN seems to have made his discourses to the people from the *Ambo*, which he sometimes calls *Exedra* (*de Civ. Dei* XXII. 8.), and sometimes *Apsis* (*Ep.* 225.), which I the rather note, because these words are of various signification among the Ancients, sometimes denoting the *Ambo*, perhaps from its orbicular form, and at other times the cross wings, and outer buildings of the Church.'—*Antiq. of Christian Church*, VIII. c. 5. §. 4. 'The usual place of the Sermon (was) some eminency in the Church, the *Ambo* or *Reading-Desk*, or else the *Bishop's throne*, or the *steps of the Altar*.'—*ib.* XIV. c. 4. §. 24. See also GAVANTI THESAURUS. i. 117. Lugduni Ed. 1664.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742) says :—' It is certain that the *Pulpit* was at first designed, not only for preaching, but for any thing else that tended to the edification of the people. There the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and Ten-Commandments, were formerly appointed to be read' &c. (He here quotes the *Injunctions* of Edward VI. we have already cited under 'LECTERN' at *page* 649 : see also the *Injunctions* in *page* 726.). 'However, *Reading-Pews* having been generally brought into use before the Restoration, it was not then thought proper to confine the use of this Office (the COMMINATION-SERVICE) any longer to the *Pulpit*, but to allow it to be said as the Minister should think proper, either there or in the *Reading-Pew*.' (*p.* 493.).—*Rat. Ill. of Book of C. Pr.*

The more modern opinions following refer, for the most part, to the *place* of the PULPIT.

The BISHOP OF DURHAM (*Dr. Maltby*), in answer to the complaints which had been preferred against certain *proceedings* adopted in Heworth Church, thus evinces the power of the Ordinary in this matter :—‘The *Pulpit* of the said Church having been placed in its present position by competent authority (such position having been shown to be most convenient), I order and direct that the same be not moved, but remain as it now is.’—*Ecccl. Gazette*, September, 1852. p. 69.

The REV. R. HART states :—‘Singularly enough, the *Pulpit* is not included in any Catalogue of Church Furniture set forth in this country during the middle ages. There are nevertheless *Pulpits* of undoubted antiquity in various parts of the kingdom....Anciently the Water-glass, termed *Clepsydra*, and the sand-glass, termed *Horologium Sciotericum*, were employed to regulate the duration of the Sermon. An iron stand for an *Hour-glass* is frequently seen at the corner of an old *Pulpit*, and sometimes the Glass itself, curiously painted and adorned, still remains, as at St Alban’s, Wood-Street, London’. In a *Note* is added :—‘Sermons were often delivered at the *Preaching-Cross*, or from the *Steps of the Altar*.’ (p. 244; see also p. 223.)—*Ecccl. Records*.

The REV. J. W. HEWETT observes with respect to its place :—‘The *Pulpit* should be placed in the Nave, on its north side. There is no necessity for the monstrous elevation which it frequently attains.’ (p. 12.)—*Arrangement of Par. Churches*.

DR. HOOK writes :—‘Sermons were originally delivered from the *Steps of the Altar*, but in our Church a raised Desk, called a *Pulpit*, is ordered in every Church, from which the Preacher addresses his flock.’—*Church Dict. Art.* ‘PULPIT.’

The REV. J. JEBB states :—‘The *Pulpit*, whenever it was a fixture, was on the north of the Choir, at the extremity of the Stalls. Ancient *Pulpits* are found in several of our Cathedrals; of stone, as at Worcester; of wood, as at Winchester. In some places as at Ely, Exeter, and Bristol, it was placed in the nave, or outer aisle; at Ely the Sermon is there preached still. At Canterbury, Christ-Church, and St Patrick’s, Dublin, the *Pulpit* was moveable: at the two latter places, within memory, it was usually kept in a bye place, and was wheeled into the centre of the Choir when the time for the Sermon arrived.’\* (p. 196.)—*Choral Service*.

The REV. G. A. POOLE, speaking of the position of the *Pulpit*, says :—‘The most ludicrous plan...is that of two rival *Pulpits* at either side of the Church one.’ (he refers in a *Note* as examples of this arrangement, to the Churches of GEORGE HERBERT, and NICHOLAS FERRAR.) ‘unless, perhaps, an arrangement which may be seen in some of the Churches in York....incredible as it may seem, the *Pulpit* is actually suspended over the middle passage to the Altar, by an arch stilted upon the sides of the Pews. The ugliest plan is the very common one of having the *Pulpit* and

---

\* This is also done at *Lincoln Cathedral* at this day.

'Reading-Desk immediately before the Altar....the *Pulpit* in itself may be beautiful, but it has no business there. One of the things to be consulted in the placing of a *Pulpit* is this, that it be towards the east. ...If the *Pulpit* is placed, which is very common, about mid-way between the east and west, the Pews immediately get a corresponding direction, and the two divisions of the Congregation sit facing one another: a position which, besides its unchurch-like aspect, must be distressingly uncomfortable to those who are just at the opposite sides of the line along which the mysterious contorting influence is developed....In small Churches, the *stone Pulpit* might be attached to the wall, and be entered through an arched door-way from the Vestry: in larger Churches, where there are side aisles, it will be best attached to one of the piers, the stone steps encircling the base. Either way....it takes up the smallest possible room. But *wooden Pulpits* are perhaps more manageable, as they are, certainly, more common. They are generally of a date posterior to the Reformation, and partake of the successive degradations in the taste of the several generations from Queen Elizabeth to the present day.' (p. 98.)—*Churches, their Structure, &c.*

The REV. J. RIDDLE, after speaking of the *Ambo* as already quoted (see page 653.), remarks:—'As the size of Churches increased, preaching in the Chancel became more and more difficult, and it often happened that the Officiating Bishop or Presbyter was inaudible on account of his great distance from the people (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* VI. 5.) Hence a custom was introduced of placing a *Suggestum*, or *Pulpit*, for the Sermon in front of the partition which divided the Chancel from the Nave.' This was called on account of its situation, '*Cancellus*.' (p. 722.)—*Christian Antiq.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, after quoting from the 'Book of Advertisements,' (of 1564) with respect to the Vestments, says:—'It would appear to be intended that the Sermons should not be in the Choir of Cathedrals, but, as is usual abroad, in the Nave.' In a *Note* is added—'This is confirmed by Abp. Bancroft's order for Canterbury Cathedral, 1608. (WILKIN'S *Conc.* IV. 436.) That upon solemn Feast-days the Sermon be made before the Communion: the *moveable Pulpit* being placed either in the Presbytery, [i. e. the space between the Stalls and the Altar. (JEBB, 196.), or Choir; and every afternoon of such Days, there be a Sermon for the city in the ordinary place." The ordinary place at Canterbury was the Chapter-house (CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 347; JEBB, 494.). The Sermon at Ely is still in the Nave. (JEBB, 196.)—*How shall we Conform to the Liturgy.* p. 108.

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE describes the *Pulpit* as:—'An elevated stage or Desk from which Sermons are delivered. They were formerly placed not only in Churches, but sometimes also in the Refectories of Monasteries....in the Cloisters....and occasionally in public thoroughfares....In Churches the *Pulpits* were formerly always placed in the Nave, attached to a wall, pillar, or screen, and the Ecclesiastics and others, who occupied the Choir during the Mass, removed into the Nave to hear the

'Sermon. Many ancient *Pulpits* exist in our Churches....some are of wood, others of stone; the wooden ones are usually polygonal, with the panels enriched with featherings, tracery, and other architectural ornaments, and raised upon a single stem; few if any of these are earlier than the Perpendicular style.... stone *Pulpits* are sometimes met with of Decorated date.... they are formed like niches in the wall, with projecting fronts, and are approached by concealed stairs, in others the steps are exposed to view....it is not unusual to find ancient *Pulpits*, both of wood and stone, surmounted with ornamental Canopies. Numerous wooden *Pulpits* were erected in this country soon after the Reformation in the Churches not previously provided with them, a number of which still remain....most of these have flat testoons over them, but some have elevated Canopies....The *Pulpits* in the large Churches on the Continent are often of very considerable size, capable of holding more than one person, and most elaborately enriched with a profusion of architectural and sculptured ornaments.'—In a *Note* is added: 'A *Pulpit* of iron is mentioned to have formerly existed in the Cathedral at Durham. This was perhaps a moveable *Lectern*, such as still exists in Rouen Cathedral.'—4th edit. p. 299.

In a Tract, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," it is stated :—'It was not the practice of the Church Catholic before the Reformation that the *Epistle* and *Gospel* should be read from the Altar. The Eastern Church used for this purpose the *Ambo*, or *Pulpit*; the Western, sometimes a *Pulpit*, and sometimes a Gallery over the Rood-Screen, called the *Rood-Loft*. The un-reformed Anglican Church followed, of course, the practice of her Western Mother....In the Reformed Church, a *Pulpit* was sometimes used for this purpose, as appears from ABP. GRINDAL'S Visitation Articles; sometimes (it would seem) the Rood-loft.' (p. 23.)....Referring to the *Preaching Pulpit*, we read :—'Where shall the *Pulpit* stand? is a question which we often hear asked. There are but two proper positions; viz. either the North-east or South-east part of the Nave, near the Nave-Arch. The *Pulpit* may either be of stone or wood....Round the upper part may be carved (*Ps.* xix. 4.), "*In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum; et in fines orbis terræ verba eorum.*" One of the great abuses of modern times is the inappropriate position and monstrous state of the *Pulpit*. It has often been placed, with the *Reading-Pue* and *Clerk's-Desk*, immediately before the High Altar, as if for the express purpose of hiding, as much as possible, the latter from the Congregation. How symbolical is this of the age which puts preaching before praying....It is necessary to strike at the root of the evil, because many people still seem to fancy that the prayers ought to be preached; and what is called *fine reading* is preferred to the *monotone*, in use till late times....Sometimes the *Pulpit* is at the west end (Alas! that it should be so in an University Church), and of course the majority of the worshippers, or rather the auditors, sit with their backs to the Altar. We meet also with parabolick *Sounding-boards*, and semi-parabolick *Sounding-boards*, and parabolick *Sounding-boards* with a slice cut out to admit the light, and *Pulpits* planted on the recumbent effigy of a knight. Who can think with patience on

'such things? If a Church is properly built, and has a good open roof, a *Sounding-board* is quite unnecessary. (p. 24)—Published by *The Cambridge Camden Society*.

The *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS," writes:—  
 'The best place for the *Pulpit* is on the north or south of the Nave, or against one of the Piers of the Chancel-Arch, or Nave-Arch. If ever in an old Church it is found elsewhere, you may be sure it has been moved. There is good reason for preferring the north pier of the Chancel-arch to any other place. Perhaps the worst of the modern places for it is in front of the Altar: sometimes it bestrides the passage which separates two rows of Pews: sometimes it has a huge sounding-board over it. It is nearly as bad to put the *Pulpit* at the west end facing the east: for in such cases almost all must turn their backs to the Holy-Table. In one beautiful Church the *Pulpit* is so high, and so flimsy, that it is quite enough to make one giddy to go up the high stairs: and the *Pulpit* and sounding-board above, and Reading-Pue below, all away with the motion....the next worst arrangement is where there are *two Pulpits* of equal height, one on each side, the one for the Prayers, the other for the Sermon; and worst of all where there are *three Pulpits*, one for the Priest, another for the Clerk, and a still higher one between the two for the Sermon; all of course with their backs to the Altar....Nor is it better when the *Pulpit*, Reading-Pue, and Clerk's-Pue, are put together, one under the other. How can the Priest lead the people in Prayer, or in the Creed, turning as of old to the east, when the *Pulpit* soars just behind him?"—*Part II. p. 10.*

The *Covering*, and the *Cushion*, appertaining to the *Pulpit*, are superfluities for which no provision is made by any special law: they are consequently referred to the general power of the Churchwardens, with the consent of the majority of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled, to supply either or both of them, should they be needed. (BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil. i. 374. a*; CRIPP'S *Laws Rel. to Ch. & Cl. 419*; STEPHENS' *Laws Rel. to Cl. 292*.) If, however, the Churchwardens refuse, the Incumbent is at liberty to supply a '*Cushion*,' if necessary to his convenience when preaching; but a *Covering* for the *Pulpit* being a matter of '*Ornament*,' it is beyond his province to interfere with respect to its provision. (See *supra*. p. 480.)

### *The Reading-Desk.*

The consideration of this '*Ornament of the Church*' has been anticipated in our discussion on the

'*Place and Position of the Officiating Minister*', (at pages 458—469); where the origin and structure of the *Reading-Desk* has been so fully described, as to call for little additional remark: we will therefore merely bring forward the authorities enjoining its use, accompanied with a few further opinions bearing especially upon its structure.

The only *Law* binding upon us with regard to the *Reading-Desk* is the 82nd CANON (of 1603-4), which thus directs:—

'We appoint... that a *convenient seat* be made for the Minister to read Service in.... to be done at the charge of the Parish.'—CANON 82.

The RUBRICS of the Book of Common Prayer afford us no instructions in the matter; and there is but one that makes the least allusion to the *Reading-Desk*. This RUBRIC is at the beginning of the 'COMMINATION SERVICE,' and reads as follows:—

¶. '*After Morning Prayer, the Litany ended according to the accustomed manner, the Priest shall, in the Reading-Pew, or Pulpit, say,*'—(1662). Present B. of Com. Pr.

Most writers on Ecclesiastical Law merely quote the 82nd CANON: (as BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil. i.* 374, a; CRIPP'S *Laws of the Cl.* 417; PRIDEAUX' *Chw. Guide* 44; ROGERS' *Eccl. L.* 154; STEER'S *Par. L.* Clive. 35; STEPHEN'S *Laws Rel. to the Ch.* 291.). We find the *Reading-Desk* to have been introduced about the same time as the *Pulpit*: but as we have already touched upon this subject, we will now merely quote a few opinions, which may be annexed to those cited at p. 469.

WHEATLY (*ob.* 1742), when speaking of the Rubric directing the Reader of the Lessons "*to turn himself so as he may best be heard,*" says:—"which shows, that in time of Prayer the Minister used to look another way; a custom still observed in some Parish-Churches, where the *Reading-Pews* have two Desks; one for the Bible, looking towards the body of the Church to the people; another for the Prayer Book looking towards the east or upper end of the Chancel; in conformity to the practice of the primitive Church," &c. (p. 139.)—*Rat. Ill. of Book of C. Pr.* (See also *supra* p. 466; and 727. under PULPIT.)

ARCHDEACON HARRISON, referring to the Injunctions of Edward VI, (1547-9) when speaking of the "*Dress of the Preacher*," remarks in a Note:—"There were not at that time, it will be recollected, *Reading-Desks* in the Churches; the Minister read 'the Service from his Seat or Stall in the quire.' (p. 51.)—*Historical Inquiry*.

DR. HOOK observes:—"The *Reading-Desk*, or *Reading-Pew*, 'appears to have been frequently erected at the same time as the Pulpit....The *Reading-Desk* is only once recognized in our Prayer-Book, and that in the Rubric prefixed to the COMMINATION; and it is remarkable that the term was first introduced there at the last Revision of the Prayer Book in 1661; it is not found in any edition printed before that time.'—(The Author concludes with the remark of BP. SPARROW which we have already quoted in p. 465).—*Church Dict.* p. 515.

The REV. G. A. POOLE says:—"Where a Chancel is fitted after 'the conventual form with Stalls, and where the Minister has one of these Stalls himself, of course his Stall is the *Reading-Desk*. A better he need not wish, and cannot have. In Rectories, where the Chancel is in the hands of the Clergyman, this arrangement will in all likelihood be daily more and more revived....He will be very anxious that the *Desk*, wherever it is, may not convey the impression of ease and repose, instead of zeal and duty....Let the *Desk* be evidently adapted, and just adapted to its uses; and let it moreover be of open tabernacle work, both as far more beautiful, and that the people may see that the Minister not only talks of kneeling, but himself kneels; not only condemns, but himself avoids all irreverent postures.' (p. 97).—*Churches, their Structure &c.*

The REV. J. C. ROBERTSON, in addition to what we have before quoted relative to the *Place* of the Minister (see *supra* p. 469.), observes:—"The only condition prescribed as to the form of the *Reading-Seat* is, that it be "*convenient*." As an abundant latitude is thus allowed, it seems very unnecessary that any party among us should make an outcry against the term '*Reading-Pew*' as one which cannot mean any thing but what is bad, or should attempt to explain away the authorities by which this Article of Church furniture is sanctioned.' (p. 72).—*How shall we Conform &c.*

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD says of the *Reading-Desk*:—"It ought not to face the people; for he (the Minister) is not addressing them, but speaking for and with them. It ought to be raised only slightly above them; for he is not, while engaged in prayer, speaking with authority as an instructor, but as one of themselves, making known their joint requests to God. Its best position seems to be at the junction of the Nave and Chancel, facing either north or south, and on the contrary side to the Pulpit'....(He here explains the sketch he gives, adding:—) 'It was thought best to make it appear only as a continuation of the adjoining Stall. A seat, one step lower, is provided in front for the Clerk, with a kneeling-stool, and a small Desk for his Book. When the LESSONS are read from the *Reading-Desk*, there ought to be a Book-board for the Bible, facing the Congregation: but a Lectern seems more appropriate for this purpose.' (p. 28).—*Parochialia*.

The *Tract*, a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," writes:—  
 'The *Reading-Pue* is a modern innovation: very ugly, very inconvenient, and quite repugnant to all real principles of devotion....It was not generally adopted before the CANON of 1603. In its stead we ought to adopt two things: the *Litany-Stool*, (improperly called, by many, the *Fald-stool*), and *Eagle* or '*Lectern*' (p. 23).—Pub. by *The Cambridge Camden Society*.

\*.\* For further information on this subject the Reader is requested to peruse the authorities cited in our observations upon the "PLACE, AND POSITION OF THE MINISTER," "The LECTERN," "The PULPIT," and "The SEDILIA."

### [The Clerk's Desk.]

THERE exists no authority, beyond that of custom, for the erection of a distinctive *Seat* or *Desk* for the PARISH CLERK: we occasionally therefore find the *Clerk's Desk* omitted in modern Churches: and in lieu of it, one of the ordinary seats near the Officiating Minister is generally assigned to him. Sometimes a kind of *Lectern* or *Fald-Stool* is employed. Where, however, a *Desk* exists, it cannot *legally* be removed without the sanction of the Ordinary and the Churchwardens.

The *Rev. G. A. Poole* is of opinion, that 'the *Clerk's Desk*, as it 'is ordinarily called, is in almost all cases, a mere encumbrance, 'of no earthly use, and without any sufficient apology. Wherever 'there is an old one, it may with propriety be removed; and 'wherever there is none, it can scarcely with propriety be supplied.' (p. 97).—*Churches, their Structure, &c.*

### [The Royal Arms.]

It appears to have been a very common practice ever since the days of *Edward VI.*, and extending down to our own times, to set up on the walls of our Protestant Churches the '*Royal Arms*,' with the intention, doubtlessly, of recognizing the supremacy of the Crown in matters Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil. There exists, however, *no temporal law*, and neither



CANON, nor RUBRIC, authorizing their erection. The first introduction of the '*King's Arms*' into our Churches seems likewise to have originated more in the loyal zeal of the people, than in any authoritative order of the Legislature. Moreover, the absence of documentary evidence on this point would lead us to suppose that it was effected very gradually and unobtrusively. The earliest mention of the usage that we have met with is in BP. BURNET's reply to NICHOLAS SANDERS's '*Book of the English Schism*,' ('De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani,' L. III. *Cologn*. 1585. 8vo), to be found in the Appendix to his '*History of the Reformation*.' There is also an incidental allusion to their introduction in the text of the History. From what we there read, it may be concluded, that the '*Royal Arms*' were first set up at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI., probably within the first fortnight, (before Feb. 13th. 1546—7), at the time of the clamorous and unauthorized removal of Images.

It may be stated, therefore, that the absence of the '*Royal Arms*,' which has been remarked in some of the *newly built Churches* of the present day, is not in subversion of any rule of Law; and that their erection indeed could not be legally enforced. But, with respect to older Churches, where the '*Royal Arms*' are still remaining; their removal, should such be contemplated, must not be attempted without the permission of the Ordinary.

We will quote the few authorities we possess on this subject.

A. D. 1546-7. BP. BURNET, in recording the history of this period between the accession of Edward VI. and the burial of the late King his father, thus remarks:—'The *Curate and Churchwardens* of St Martin's, in Ironmonger-Lane, in London, took down the Images and Pictures of the Saints, and the Crucifix, out of their Church, and painted many texts of Scripture on the walls; some of them, "according to a perverse translation," as the complaint has it; and in the place where the Crucifix was, they set up the KING'S ARMS with some texts of Scripture about it: upon this the Bishop (*Bonner*), and Lord Mayor of London, complained to the Council.' (*Hist. of the Ref.* Nare's edit. Vol. ii. p. 13.).

Again,—‘GARDINER, hearing that, on May-day the people of *Portsmouth* had removed and broken the Images of Christ and the Saints, writ about it, with great warmth, to one *Captain VAUGHAN*, that waited on the Protector, and was then at *Portsmouth*.’ .... The PROTECTOR wrote in answer:—‘That he allowed of his zeal against innovations, but there were other things that needed to be looked to as much. Great difference there was between the *civil respect due to the ‘King’s Arms’* and the worship given to Images.’ &c. (*ib.* p. 17.).—

In the *Appendix* we find the following quotation from SANDERS’S *Book*, and BURNET’S reply:—‘SANDERS says: “They ordered all Images to be removed, and sent some lewd men over England for that effect; who either brake or burnt the Images of our Saviour, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints; therein declaring against whom they made war; and they ordered the *‘King’s Arms,’* three leopards and three lilies, with the supporters, a dog and a serpent, to be set in the place where the Cross of Christ stood; thereby owning that they were no longer to worship Jesus Christ, whose Images they broke, but the KING, whose Arms they set up in the room of those Images.” BURNET answers:—“In this period there is an equal mixture of falsehood and malice. (1) The Parliament did not order the removal of Images; it was done by the King’s Visitors before the Parliament sat. (2) The total removal of Images was not done the *first year*, only those Images that were abused to superstition, were taken down, and a year after the total removal followed. (3) They took care that this should be done regularly, not by the Visitors, who only carried the King’s Injunctions about it, but by the Curates themselves. (4) *They did not order the ‘KING’S ARMS’ to be put in the place where the Cross had stood. It grew indeed to be a custom to set them up in all Churches*, thereby expressing, that they acknowledged the King’s authority reached even to their Churches; but there was no order made about it. (5) I leave him to the correction of the heralds, for saying, the *‘King’s Arms’* are three leopards, when every body knows they are three lions, and a lion, not a dog, is one supporter, and the other is a dragon, not a serpent. (6) By their setting up the *‘KING’S ARMS,’* and not his picture, it is plain they had no thought of worshipping their King, but did only acknowledge his authority. (7) It was no less clear, that they had no design against the worship due to Jesus Christ, nor that inferior respect due to the blessed Virgin and Saints; but intended only to wean the people from that, which at best was but pagantry: but as it was practised, was manifest idolatry. And the painting on the walls of the Churches, the Ten-Commandments, the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, with many other passages of Scripture that were of most general use, shewed, they intended only to cleanse their Churches from those mixtures of heathenism, that had been brought into the Christian Religion.”—*History of the Reformation*. Nares’s Edit. App. Vol. iv. p. 402.

Our writers on *Ecclesiastical Law* refer the creation of the *‘Royal Arms’* in Churches to the power of the Vestry, and the consent of the Ordinary. After enumerating the more important ‘Ornaments of the Church,’ they proceed:—

‘There are many other Articles for which *no provision is made by any special law*, and therefore must be referred to the general power of the Churchwardens, with the consent of the major part of the Parishioners as aforesaid, and under the direction of the Ordinary; such as the erecting Galleries &c....Clock, Chimes, *King's Arms*, Pulpit-cloths &c.’—BURN’S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 374; CRIPPS’ *Laws Rel. to the Ch. & the Cl.* 419; STEPHEN’S *Laws Rel. to the Cl.* 292.

With respect to modern usage we may quote the following:—

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM (*Dr. Maltby*), in answer to certain complaints made to him against the practices adopted in the Church of *Heworth*, stated:—‘The *Royal Arms*’ having been placed in their present situation at the West end of the said Church, without the sanction of the Ordinary, and it having been certified to me that such situation is unbecoming, and that the front of the principal gallery is a convenient and appropriate situation for them, I hereby order and direct that the said *Royal Arms*’ be forthwith removed from their present situation, and placed in the front of the said gallery.’—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*, September, 1852, p. 69.

THE REV. F. C. MASSINGBERD says:—‘The people also began in some places to show their expectation and desire of a change, by taking down Images from the Churches, and setting up the *King's Arms*’ where the Holy Rood had been placed....It must have seemed irreverent to substitute the *King's Arms*’ in their place; but it does not appear that this was ever commanded, and if so, the universal adoption of the practice seems to imply that the Royal Supremacy was popular?’ (p. 340).—*The English Reformation*, 2nd. Ed.

In a *Tract* a ‘FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS’ we read:—‘It is bad to have the *Royal Arms*’ in stained glass in the east window; for though no one loves the Crown more than I do, yet I do not like to see its mark where some higher and holier symbol ought to be. And for the same reasons, I would not renew the *Royal Arms*’ painted on board, and put up over the Chancel-Arch. I know of no authority for this: and surely it is at least an unseemly successor of the emblems of our redemption which used to stand there.’ (p. 18).—*Part. II.* Published by *The Ecclesiological Society*.

### *Scripture Sentences.*

ORNAMENTING the walls of Churches with *Texts of Scripture*, and other *Chosen Sentences*, is a custom of great antiquity, although, till within the last few years, it appears to have been very much disused. The

practice is enjoined in the 82nd CANON (of 1603-4), which is still binding upon the Clergy of the present day, and indeed it is the only authority advocating its adoption. There is no legal prohibition existing against the revival of the usage; so that, with the sanction of the Ordinary, it may at any time be resumed: the expediency, however, of such a measure must be determined by the peculiar circumstances of each individual Parish; more especially since the expences are to be borne by the Parishioners at large.

The CANON thus reads:—

‘...We appoint...that the “Ten-Commandments” be set  
‘up &c....and other chosen Sentences written upon the walls of  
‘the said Churches and Chapels, in places convenient...all  
‘these to be done at the charge of the Parish.’—CANON 82.

\*. \* *Ecclesiastical Lawyers* in alluding to this subject merely cite the clause of the CANON above given, as may be seen in BURN’S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 371; C. G. PRIDEAUX’ *Chw. Guide*, 45; ROGERS’ *Eccl. L.* 156; STEPHEN’S *Laws Rel. to Cl.* 288; also DR. HOOK’S *Church Dict.* p. 453.

MR. CRIPPS (*Barrister-at-Law*) in quoting the CANON slightly differs in the phraseology, saying:—‘*Chosen Sentences* are also ‘directed to be written upon the walls in convenient places, and ‘these most frequently are the Lord’s Prayer, the Apostles’ Creed, ‘&c. CAN. 82.’—*Laws Rel. to Ch. and Cl.* p. 419.

There are many Clergymen who consider the requirements of this CANON to be fulfilled by the setting up of the *Creed*, and the *Lord’s Prayer*, by the side of the Ten-Commandments, as may so frequently be seen at the east end of our Churches; while others, giving a different interpretation to the CANON, contend, that ‘*Chosen Sentences*’ are to be written on different parts of the walls of the Church, and not collectively on one spot, or tablet. Hence we occasionally see in a few modern Churches, where the custom has been revived, *Texts of Scripture* painted on scrolls or panels of various forms, and in Lombardick or other peculiar letters of divers colours. These letters, however, ought not to be of such a kind as can neither be read, nor ‘understood of the people;’ nor indeed should the maxims of human composition be allowed to supersede the use of passages from Holy Writ.

At the time of the Reformation these Inscriptions were frequently of a somewhat polemical character. We find Bp. BONNER in the reign of Queen MARY (in 1554) issuing a mandate ordering their erasure, thus :—

‘Because some children of iniquity, given up to carnal desires and novelties have by many ways enterprized to bauish the ancient manner and order of the Church....and also have procured as a stay to their heresies (as they thought) *certain Scriptures* wrongly applied, to be painted upon the Church Walls...we do straightly charge and command you, that at the receipt hereof...you do warn &c. all and singular Churchwardens and Parishioners whosoever...that they abolish and extinguish such manner of Scriptures, so that by no means they be either read or seen’... (in failure thereof the parties) ‘to be excommunicated, and otherwise punished for such their negligence, slackness, and fault.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 135.

In 1571 (*temp.* Elizabeth) the CANONS of that year enjoined differently, thus:—‘*Aeditui curabunt &c....utque Templorum parietes nova fidelia inducantur, et lectissimis sanctarum Scripturarum sententiis illustrentur. Ut illarum lectione et admonitu populus possit ad pietatem commoveri.*’—SPARROW’S *Coll.* 235.

The antiquity of the usage may be gathered from the following opinions :—

BINGHAM (*ob.* 1723.) says :—‘The walls of the Church seem commonly to have had some *select portions of Scripture* written upon them, containing some proper admonition and instruction for all in general, or else more peculiar to that order of persons who had their station in such a particular part or division of the Church (AMBROS. *ad Virg. Laps.*)....But beside these lessons out of the inspired writings, it was very usual to have *other inscriptions* of human composure written on the several parts and utensils of many churches. (PAULINUS Ep. 12. *ad Sever.*; SIDONIUS APOL. l. iv. Ep. 18.)’—*Antiq. of Christian Church.* b. viii. c. 8. § 3, 4.

The Rev. J. E. RIDDLE refers to the same authorities as BINGHAM, remarking :—‘*Portions of Scripture, or other Inscriptions, were frequently written upon the walls of the Church: a mode of adorning the sacred edifice which is perhaps the most ancient, as it is certainly the most appropriate and instructive, of any which have from time to time prevailed.*’ (p. 741)—*Christian Antiquities.* (In STEPHEN’S *Book of Com. Pr.* E. H. S. p. 350. the usage is explained in the same words).

The Rev. J. C. ROBERTSON, referring to this CANON, says :—‘It is obvious that the intention of these orders as to the *Decalogue*, and *other texts*, is not fulfilled, unless the character adopted be one which people of scanty education can read without difficulty.’ (p. 155. n.)—*How shall we Conform to the Liturgy.*

The Rev. G. A. POOLE writes :—‘The most simple occupant of the walls of Churches is a *series of passages from the Sacred*

'*Scriptures*, or of moral sentences of tried wisdom, and appropriate tendency. The introduction of these Inscriptions is very ancient.' (The author then refers to Bingham's observations already quoted, and concludes with numerous examples of existing Inscriptions, to which we must refer our Readers who would pursue this subject further).—*Churches, their Structure, &c.* p. 74.

[Sedilia, Altar-Chairs, &c.]

We have already shewn, that previous to the introduction of the *Reading-Desk*, the place of the Officiating Minister in celebrating MORNING and EVENING PRAYER was 'his own seat in the Chancel'. This seat may have been either a *Stall*, a *Fald-stool*, or one of the *Sedilia*; and its position was probably derived from the arrangements in this respect adopted in the early Churches. The Bishop in primitive times usually occupied a throne (*Bema*, *Sedes* hence 'See,' or *Cathedra* hence 'Cathedral') in the centre of the apse of the Choir, and his Presbyters sat on lesser thrones or seats placed semicircularly on each side of him\*. When *Parochial Churches* were erected, the same arrangement was aimed at, in so far as it was suitable to the more limited character of the religious services performed in them, so that the Presbyters and their assistant Clergy were generally placed on one side, usually the south side of the Chancel. Here were provided either fixed *Benches*, *Stalls*, or *Sedilia*, or moveable *Fald-stools*. From these positions the Ministers would move to the north, or south side, or to the front of the Altar, as circumstances might render necessary during the celebration of the Mass. The Episcopal throne was of course unnecessary; still, on the occasion of a visit from the Bishop of the Diocese, a *Chair* was usually provided on the north side of the Altar, except, as often happened, the Bishop brought his own *Fald-stool*. At the Reformation, however, when the Officiating Minister was removed into the

---

\* See BINGHAM'S *Antiq. of Christian Church*, B. II. c. 9. § 7; *ib.* c. 19. § 5.; *ib.* B. VIII. c. 6. § 10.

body of the Church, the Priests' *Stalls*, and the *Sedilia*, became gradually disused; and to meet the requirements of the temporary *Fald-stool* for the Bishop, or of a seat for an occasionally Assistant Clergyman, *Altar-Chairs* were permanently supplied. There is however no LAW, nor CANON, enforcing the construction of *Sedilia*, the erection of *Stalls*, or the provision of *Altar-Chairs* for the convenience, either of the Bishop, or of the Officiating Clergyman. Should therefore one or other of these seats be needed, as may sometimes be the case, especially at *Visitations*, and *Confirmations*, the Incumbent has no power to lay the burden upon the Parishioners, but must defray the expenses of their provision out of his own resources.

ALTAR-CHAIRS.—Confining our remarks now to *Altar-Chairs*, we may observe that there are a few instances where an *Altar-Chair*, or some such accommodation, is absolutely required by the RUBRICS, as in the *Ordination*, and *Consecration Services*: but as these are generally solemnized in the Cathedral Church of the Diocese, or in the Bishop's Private Chapel, it is usually provided out of the funds of the See; in Cathedrals, the Dean and Chapter sometimes supply the *Altar-Chairs*.

The Rubrics will be found in the ORDINAL of our present Liturgy (of 1662.)

In the '*Ordering of Deacons*' the second RUBRIC reads:—

(a) ¶ '*First, the Archdeacon, or his Deputy, shall present unto the Bishop (sitting in his Chair, near to the Holy Table) such as,*' &c. (1662).—KEELING 366. Present B. of Com. Pr.

\*. In the Liturgy of 1552 the words, '*sitting in his Chair near to the Holy Table,*' are wanting.—KEELING *ib.*; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 137.

At the administration of the *Oath of Supremacy*, the RUBRIC is:

(b) ¶ '*And before the Gospel, the Bishop, sitting in his Chair (in a Chair, 1552), shall cause the Oath*' &c. (1662)—KEELING 372; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 145.

In the '*Ordering of Priests*' the second RUBRIC of the Office is very similar to that in the '*Ordering of Deacons*' (a) thus :—

- (c) ¶ '*First, the Archdeacon, or, in his absence, one appointed in his stead, shall present unto the Bishop (sitting in his Chair near to the Holy Table), all them,*' &c. (1662)—KEELING 376.

At the administration of the *Oath of Supremacy*, the RUBRIC is also similar to that (b) in the preceding Office, thus :—

- (d) ¶ '*Then the Bishop, sitting in his Chair, shall minister,*' &c. (1662).—KEELING 381.

\*.\* The Rubric (marked c) is not in this Office in the Liturgy of 1552; and the Rubric (d) of 1552 omits '*sitting in his Chair*.' KEELING *ib.*; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 148. 153.

In the *Consecration Service*, at the presentation of the Bishop-elect, the RUBRIC reads :—

- (e) ¶ '*...the Elected Bishop (vested with his rochet) shall be presented by two Bishops unto the Archbishop of that Province, (or to some other Bishop appointed by lawful Commission), the Archbishop sitting in his Chair near the Holy Table, and,*' &c. (1662).—KEELING 390.

\*.\* In the Liturgy of 1552 the words '*sitting in his Chair near the Holy Table*' in the above Rubric (e) are wanting.—KEELING *ib.*; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 160.

Before the '*Articles of Examination*' in this same Office, the RUBRIC is :—

- (f) ¶ '*Then the Archbishop, sitting in his Chair (in a Chair 1552), shall say,*' &c. (1662).—KEELING 391; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 161.

DR. NICHOLLS (*ob.* 1712), in his comments here, thus remarks :—  
 'This usage, for the Bishop to sit in a *Chair* or *Seat* prepared for this purpose, and placed near the Altar at the time of Ordination, is very ancient in the Church. But it must be noted, that this *Seat* was not the great Seat of the Bishop, where he sat during the Lessons and Sermons, which was called *θρόνος*, from whence he was said *ἐνθρονίζεσθαι*, because of his being solemnly placed therein at his Inauguration, or admission into his Bishoprick. For that was a large Seat built in the Church upon an high basis and eminence, and not removable as this lesser Seat was. And thus the Greek Ordinal distinguishes them, for it says, that at the Ordination of a Presbyter "*καθεται κ. τ. λ. εἰς θρόνον μικρόν*" "The Bishop sits before the Holy Table upon a little *Seat*." '*(vid. Off. Consec. Presb. in Habert. Hier. p. 106.)*. This Seat the



'Roman Ordinals call '*Faldistorium*.' "Episcopus accedit ad "*Faldistorium* &c.".... "The Bishop comes to the *Faldistory* "before the Altar." (*vid. Pont. Rom.*) This barbarous word "seems to be derived from the German word *Falden*, which signifies 'to fold.' It being a *Chair* or *Stool* made so that it might "be folded together, for the better conveniency of removing from "place to place; and seems to be the same with the Greek "*ἐκλαδισαι* mentioned by Athæneus (*l. 12. vid. du Fresn. in voce*).'  
—*Book of Com. Pr.* "The Form and Manner of Making of Deacons,"  
*in loco*.

We may now add a few confirmatory authorities:—

THE REV. R. HART says:—"Independently of his fixed throne, 'the Bishop had a *movable Seat* which might be placed for his 'accommodation near the Altar, or in other parts of the Church. 'It was usually a *folding Chair*, which might be opened like an 'X, whence it was termed *Faldistorium*, or *Sella plicatilis*.' (p. 246.)—*Ecccl. Records*.

DR. HOOK however describes a '*Faldistory*' as:—"The Episcopal *Seat* or *throne*, within the Chancel."—*Church Dict.* p. 266.

THE REV. J. JERR says:—"In the arrangement of the British 'Churches is often found a *Chair* on each side of the Altar, for the 'use of the two principal Clergymen during the intervals of duty: 'and also a long *Faldstool* on each side for the others, when they 'come up from the Choir, to assist in the administration of the 'Holy Communion, or to receive it. This seems to be a modification of the primitive *apsidal seats* of the Superior Clergy. The 'recent condemnation of these Chairs by some antiquarians seems 'somewhat precipitate. However, they ought to be used during the 'intervals of the Communion Service only, not at Matins or 'Evensong.' (p. 196.)—*Choral Service*.

THE REV. G. A. POOLE remarks:—"Of the use of the *Chair* (at the 'north side of the Altar) for the Officiating Priest, we have a 'singular and very ancient record. Edward I. presented the *Coronation Chair* of the Kings of Scotland to the Abbey of Westminster, for the use of the Priest celebrating before Edward the 'Confessor's shrine. (*Archæologia* xi. 395). It is said that the '*Chair* at the north of the Altar in York Minster is older than the 'Cathedral itself, being that in which several of the Saxon Kings, 'and also Richard III. and James I. were crowned.' (p. 108.)—*Churches, Their Structure &c.*

THE GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE, defines a *Fald-stool*, *Folding-stool*, or *Faldstory*, to be:—"A portable Seat made to 'fold up in the manner of a camp stool: it was made either of 'metal or wood, and sometimes was covered with rich silk. Formerly, when a Bishop was required to Officiate in any but his 'own Cathedral Church where his throne was erected, a *Faldstool* 'was placed for him in the Choir, and he frequently carried one 'with him in his journeys.... This term is also frequently, but 'erroneously, applied to the *Litany-Stool*.' (p. 153.)—4th Edition.

In the *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," we read:—"The Cambridge Camden Society has always refused to

'give patterns for, or to sanction, *Altar-Chairs*; and their example has been followed in other quarters. The two luxurious *Altar-Chairs*, north and south of the *Altar*, facing the Congregation, are quite irreverent; while their occupants stared by, and compelled to stare at the whole Congregation, devotional feelings being almost necessarily extinguished, can only vary this most offensively public situation, by making the Holy Table itself, with even greater indecorum, a place to lean upon, and a Book-rest.' (p. 15).—Published by *The Cambridge Camden Society*.

With respect to the *position* of the *Altar-Chairs*, there seems to be a difference of practice. It is more usual that they should face the 'Communion-Table,' whether they be filled, or vacant. When, however, they are occupied by the Bishop, and his Chaplain, as at *Visitations*, and *Confirmations*, they face the Congregation. It will be found also, that generally speaking, the architectural ornament of *Altar-Chairs* is in accordance with the position looking north and south.

**SEDILIA.**—These are *Stone Seats* fixed in recesses in the southern wall of the Chancel, and were formerly occupied by the Priest and his attendants in the celebration of the Mass. There is no LAW, CANON, nor *authority*, prescribing their adoption in the Protestant Churches of our time; consequently, a revival of their use would in the generality of instances jeopardize the peace of our Congregations. As, however, *Sedilia* have in some places been again brought into use, we will quote a few elucidatory opinions.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM (*Dr. Maltby*), in answer to certain complaints made to him respecting the new arrangements in the Church of Heworth, thus decided in the matter before us:—'A stone Table, and two stone *Chairs* or *Sedilia*, having been placed without competent authority, on the south side of the Communion-Table, I hereby order and direct, that the same be forthwith removed.'—*Eccl. Gazette*, September, 1852, p. 69.

THE REV. R. HART describes *Sedilia* as:—'Stone Seats under Canopies on the south wall near the Altar, where the Officiating Clergy sat during the intervals of the Service. (*Archæologia* x. 291.). Most commonly there are *three*, for the Priest, Deacon, and Subdeacon at High Mass, the Seats being raised like steps of stairs, to mark the gradations of the Ministry....but sometimes they are on a level, and they also vary in number.' (p. 231.).—*Ecclesiastical Records*.

The REV. J. W. HEWETT speaks of the Morning and Evening Prayer being properly used in the Chancel, and adds :—‘Provision must therefore be made in it for those by whom the Services are performed; and the Chaucels, remaining as in time past, afford them this provision in the “*Stalls*,” which run along their north and south sides, and are returned against the Rood-Screen. There are few Churches in which, occasionally at least, two Clergymen do not take part in the Service, and frequently three; still, more than three *Stalls* are required, as well for the use of stranger Clericks, as to meet the requirements of a Visitation. (p. 8.)....The *Sedilia*, commonly three in number, which formerly served for the Priest, Deacon, and Sub-Deacon, are still the natural seats for the celebrant Priest, the Epistler, and Gospeller of our Reformed Church. They are usually placed in the south wall, with the Piscina adjoining to them; the Credence is on the north side.’ (p. 10).—*Arrangement of Parish Churches*.

Dr. HOOK merely defines *Sedilia* as :—‘*Seats near an Altar, almost universally on the south side, for the Ministers Officiating at the Holy Eucharist. They are generally three in number, but vary from one to five.*’—*Church Dict.* p. 580.

The REV. G. A. POOLE follows very much in the same strain, thus :—‘The *Sedilia*, at the south side of the Altar, are provided for the Clergymen assisting at the Holy Eucharist, as the *Chair* at the north side is for the consecrating Priest. They vary in number from one to five, the most usual number being three. They are usually niches in the Chancel wall, with stone seats.’ (p. 108).—*Churches, Their Structure, &c.*

The GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE explains the word *Sedile*, *Sedilia*, as :—‘The Latin name for a *Seat*, which in modern times has come to be pretty generally applied by way of distinction to the Seats on the south side of the Choir near the Altar in Churches, used in the Roman Catholic service by the Priest and his attendants, the Deacon and Sub-deacon, during certain parts of the Mass: they were sometimes moveable, but more usually in this country were formed of masonry and recessed in the wall like niches....A few are of as early date as the latter part of the 12th century, but the majority are later, extending to the end of the Perpendicular style; in general they contain three separate Seats, but occasionally two, or only one, and in a few rare instances, four....or five....They are very commonly placed at different levels, the eastern seat being a step the highest, and the western the lowest; but sometimes when three are used, the two western seats are on the same level, a step below the other, and sometimes the two eastern are level, and the western a step below them.’ (p. 333).—4th Edition.

In a *Tract*, “A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS,” it is stated :—‘The *Stalls* north and south of the Chancel are the *Seats* set apart for Ecclesiasticks who are not immediately engaged in the Service; indeed, with the exception of the “*Lessons*,” which are read from the Eagle-Desk, and the “*Litany*,” which is said from a Litany-Desk, all the Prayers of both Matins and Evensong ought to be offered by the Officiating

'Clergyman from his *Stall*. When, however, the Holy Communion is to be administered, the right place for the Clergy is on the south side of the Altar, where the *Three Seats* or *Sedilia* for the Priest, Deacon, and Sub-deacon of the unreformed Rite, are occupied by the Celebrant, Gospeller, and Epistler of the present Liturgy. When these *Sedilia* are not, as they ought to be, provided in the fabrick of the Church, three *Stools*, (properly called *Faldstools*, though the Coronation Service uses this word for a Kneeling-Desk) ought to be placed in a similar position.' (p. 15).—Published by *The Cambridge Camden Society*.

In a Tract, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS," it is stated:—'There should be *Seats* for the Officiating Priests, if possible on the south side of the Altar. Where the stone seats, or *Sedilia*, remain, they may be fitted with cushions, and brought into use again.' (p. 9).—PART II. Pub. by the 'ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.'

The INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA, describing the Chancel of St Mary's Church, Cobham, Kent, states:—'The three niches on the south side are the *Sedilia* for the Clergy who are engaged in the Altar Service. *No other Altar-Seats have any authority.*' PLATE 6.—Further on it adds:—'These *Sedilia* are to be made in the thickness of the wall, at the south eastern part of the Chancel.' PLATES 25. 43.—'There are also *wooden Sedilia.*' PLATE 54.

### [Table of Benefactions.]

It is very important that property bequeathed for the benefit of the Poor of a Parish, or for the good of a neighbourhood, should be publicly recorded, in order that the management and appropriation of the Bequest may be faithfully executed; and that succeeding generations may be enabled to secure 'the Charity' in all its integrity. Besides which, such a memento is calculated to incite posterity to imitate the good deeds of their fore-fathers. It has been usual to paint the clause of the Testator's Will conveying the Bequest, on some conspicuous part of the Church, annexing to it the date, and the names of the then Minister, and Churchwardens. Occasionally, a *Tablet* containing a record of the Legacy may be seen set up on the front of a gallery, or upon the walls of the Church; indeed, instances are not wanting where this is a condition expressed in the Will. There is however no law, nor authority, directing

that "*Tables of Benefactions*" should be set up in the Parish Church, nor is there any enactment prohibitory of the usage: still, their erection must not be injurious to the fabric; nor should they be allowed to occupy so prominent a position as to be detrimental to the architectural appearance of the Church. Moreover, before such erection can be effected, not only is the consent of the Incumbent and Churchwardens necessary, but the sanction of the Ordinary ought also, *strictly speaking*, to be first obtained.

DR. MARKLAND says on this subject:—"The perishable *Boards* 'with the names of Benefactors, formerly employed, but now rapidly disappearing, should give way to suitable *slabs of marble* 'or *stone*, inserted for the purpose in the very walls themselves, 'where they might be seen by all, but would not disfigure the 'building.' (p. 110).—*Remarks on English Churches*.

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD writes:—"It having been necessary to 'remove some Notices of *Charitable Bequests* from the piers of the 'Church, which they disfigured, they have been painted upon the 'leaves of a *Triptych*, and placed in the Tower, just above the 'Alms-Chest. In this position, the inscription readily meets the 'eye, and may serve as a persuasive to the charitable acts thus 'recorded.' (p. 32).—*Parochialia*.

In the *Tract*, A "FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS," it is stated:—"There is room for care as to the way of recording these '*Benefactions*. The *Tables* on which they are painted ought to be 'put where they will not interfere with any thing else: but never 'on gallery-fronts, or in any too conspicuous place.' (p. 15).—PART II. Published by the "ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY."

### *Table of Levitical Degrees.*

Among the legal disabilities to a contract of *Marriage* is the existence of too close a relationship; *i. e.* where the parties are related within the *Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity*, defined according to the spirit and the letter of the *Levitical law*, as laid down in *Leviticus* xviii. 6—20.

By both CANON, and STATUTE LAW, the *Levitical Degrees* are declared to be the rule of prohibition against a Marriage contract; and as there are in-

stances not expressly mentioned in *Leviticus*, which are on principle (*puritate rationis*) equally forbidden (GIBS. 412), it is indispensably necessary, in order to prevent litigation, injury, and wrong, that the several DEGREES *actually*, as well as *inferentially* prohibited in the book of *Leviticus*, be plainly set forth, that they may be known and understood by the people at large. To this end, ABP. PARKER, in 1563, compiled a *Table of the Prohibited Degrees*, which he ordered to be set up in the Churches of his province of Canterbury. Subsequently, the CANONS (of 1603-4), which are still binding upon us, confirmed ABP. PARKER'S '*Table*;' the 99th CANON declaring it to be the authorized interpretation of the laws of God upon this subject, and directing a copy of it to be set up in every Church. This '*Table of Degrees*' became by this injunction of the CANON part of the Marriage law, so far as that law is administered in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It should consequently be hung up in some convenient place within the Church, where it may be consulted by all.

The CANON runs thus:

'No person shall marry within the *Degrees prohibited* by the 'Laws of God, and expressed in a TABLE set forth by authority 'in the year of our Lord God, 1563. And all Marriages so made 'and contracted shall be judged incestuous and unlawful, and 'consequently shall be dissolved as void from the beginning, 'and the parties so married shall by course of law be separated. 'And the aforesaid TABLE shall be in every Church publicly set 'up, and fixed, at the charge of the Parish.'—CANON 99.

Still, by this CANON, and the force of the ancient Statutes, Marriages within these *Prohibited Degrees* were not *ipso facto* void, but merely voidable; and could only be annulled by the Ecclesiastical Courts during the *joint lives* of the husband and wife; so that though considered incestuous, by the *Ecclesiastical Courts*, yet the offspring were held to be legitimate until the Marriage should be dissolved before the death of either parent. (GOD. 486; CO. LIT. 33; 2 Phil. 10). At length, in order to remove this injurious uncertainty of the law, an Act was passed, the 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54. A. D 1835. which,

after describing the previous state of the question, declares that all Marriages within the *Prohibited Degrees*, existing at the time the law was made, shall not be annulled; except such as might be *sub judice* at the passing of the Act: thus—

‘Whereas Marriages between persons *within the prohibited degrees* are voidable only by sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court pronounced during the life-time of both the parties thereto, and it is unreasonable that the state and condition of the Children of Marriages between persons *within the prohibited degrees of affinity* should remain unsettled during so long a period, and it is fitting that all Marriages which may hereafter be celebrated between persons *within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity or affinity* should be *ipso facto* void, and not merely voidable; be it therefore enacted . . . that all Marriages which shall have been celebrated before the passing of this Act (August 31st, 1835) between persons being *within the prohibited degrees of affinity* shall not hereafter be annulled for that cause by any sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, unless pronounced in a suit which shall be depending at the time of the passing of this Act, provided that nothing hereinbefore enacted shall affect Marriages between persons being *within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity*.’—Sect. 1.

In future (*i. e.* after A. D. 1835) Marriages *within the Prohibited Degrees* are to be *ipso facto* void: thus—

‘And be it further enacted that all Marriages which shall hereafter be celebrated between persons *within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity* shall be absolutely null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever.’—Sect. 2. . . .  
‘Provided always that nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend to . . . Scotland.’—Sect. 3.

This Statute is to be interpreted by a reference to the *Canons* (of 1603-4), and to ABP. PARKER’S *Table*; and these again would be explained by the 25 *Hen. VIII. c. 22.* (See *infra*.) The above Act, (5 & 6 *Will. IV. c. 54.*) is the law regulating this question at the present day.

It will be necessary here, perhaps, to explain the terms *Consanguinity*, and *Affinity*, and the method of computation with respect to these *Degrees* :—

By the term *Consanguinity*, is to be understood relationship ‘by blood;’ and by *Affinity*, relationship ‘by marriage.’ *Consanguinity* moreover is either *lineal*, or *collateral*. *Lineal Consanguinity* is where the relationship is in the *direct line*, whether ascending, as ‘Father,’ ‘Grandfather,’ &c.; or descending, as ‘Son,’ ‘Grandson,’ &c. *Collateral Consanguinity* is where the relationship is not in the direct line, but springs or branches out in an *oblique* direction from one and the same ancestor in the direct line, as ‘Brother,’ ‘Uncle,’ ‘Nephew,’ ‘Cousin’ &c.

Similarly with regard to *Affinity*; those who are related to the Husband by blood (*consanguinity*) are related to the Wife in the same degree by Affinity; and conversely: But, says DR. BURN, the 'kindred of the husband are not of affinity to the kindred of the wife; and therefore the husband's brother may marry the wife's sister, as well as the husband's son by a former wife may marry the wife's daughter by a former husband. The Affinity is terminated in the husband himself from the wife's kindred, and in the wife herself from the husband's kindred. (WOOD *Civ. L.* 119.)—*Ecc. L. Phil.* ii. 450.

In computing the degree of relationship in the *direct line*, the Civil, Canon, and Common Law, adopt one and the same rule; i. e. every remove or generation is reckoned *one degree*, both in ascending and descending: thus—a 'Father' is a relation in the 1st degree, a 'Grand-father' in the 2nd degree, a 'Great-grand-father' in the 3rd degree, and so on. In like manner in the descending line, a 'Son' is a relation in the 1st degree, a 'Grand-son' in the 2nd degree, &c.

In the *Collateral line* the computation is different; in the case of *Marriage Contracts*, as well as in the *distribution of personal property* (by 22 & 23 *Car. II. c. 10.*), the rule of the *Roman Civil Law* is adopted;\* *exempli gratia*:—To find the degree of relationship of A to his second cousin F, proceed as follows—Count from A upwards in the direct line to the common ancestor, and then downwards obliquely to the standing of F, thus:—From A to A's father, B, *one degree*; to B's father C, *two*, (who is the common ancestor of A and F); then proceed obliquely downwards to D the other son of C, grand-father of F, and uncle of A, *three*; then to E, the uncle's son, father of F, and first-cousin of A, *four*; and lastly to F, the first-cousin's Son, or A's second-cousin, *five*: consequently the relation of A to F is in the *fifth degree*. This, says MR CRIPPS is also the method of the *Jewish Computation*, 'and in this order of computation, *cousin-germans* are held to be of the 4th degree, and to have liberty to marry. (BACON'S *Abr. Marriage A.*). This likewise was the ancient sense of the Christian Church, and even of the Church of Rome in the time of Pope GREGORY; for in writing to AUSTIN Bp. of Canterbury, he says, "in quartâ generatione contracta matrimonia minimè solverentur;" but afterwards,

---

\* According to the computation of the *Canon Law* (*Decret.* 4. 14. 3 & 9), which is generally followed by the Law of England (*Co. Litt.* 23) in the descent of real estates—the degree if equal, or the remotest degree if different, at which two persons stand from the common stock or one and the same Ancestor, is the degree of their relationship to each other: thus—What is the degree of relationship between the two cousins A. and F. above mentioned?—Tracing each up to the common ancestor who is C, we find as regards A, that he is distant from C *two degrees*, thus—A to B, his father, is *one*, to his grand-father C, *two*; as regards F. we find he is *three removes* from C, thus—F to E, his father, is *one*, to his grandfather D, *two*, to his great grandfather C, *three Degrees*; consequently the relationship between A and F, is, by this computation, in the 3rd degree; whereas by the *Roman Civil Law*, as shown above, he is in the *fifth degree*.



'when they found that dispensations for incestuous marriages brought great profit to the Church of Rome, and knowing it had obtained universally in the Christian Church that it was lawful to marry in the 4th degree, Pope ALEXANDER II. (A. D. 1061—1072) began a new computation of degrees; and he said that the secular computation, which was the computation of the Civil Law, was not properly adapted to the decisions touching incestuous Marriages; but they ought to compute up to the Common Stock &c. (see note)....so that the first cousins that are in the 4th degree, by the received computation in the Mosaic and Civil Law, were now by the Canonical computation thrown into the 2nd degree; and by this alteration of the computation of degrees, they forbad not only first cousins, but second and third cousins to marry, unless they obtained dispensations. (VAUGH. 210; BACON'S Abr. 16.)'—*Laws of Ch. and Clergy.*

DR BURN says on this question:—'By the Civil Law, first cousins are allowed to marry; but by the Canon Law both first and second cousins (in order to make dispensations more frequent and necessary) are prohibited. Therefore when it is vulgarly said that first cousins may marry, but second cousins cannot, probably this arose by confounding these two laws; for first cousins may marry by the Civil Law, and second cousins cannot by the Canon law. (WOOD Civ. L. 118, 119; AYLIF. Par. 364.)'—*Eccles. L. Phil. ii. 449.*

To acquire a just comprehension of this important question of the *Levitical Degrees*, it will be necessary to trace historically, yet briefly, the progress of the *Canon and Statute laws* bearing upon the subject.

The first legal attempt to define the *Prohibitory Degrees* was made in the 25th year of the reign of HENRY VIII. (A. D. 1533), when that Monarch, anxious to wed Anne Bolcyn, procured an Act to be passed (25 Hen. VIII. c. 22.) annulling his marriage with Catharine of Arragon; by this Statute also the Princess Mary was put out of the succession, which was secured to the issue of Anne, from whom descended Elizabeth. Moreover, into this Act the Parliament took the opportunity of introducing a clause declaratory of the *prohibited degrees*, in order to prevent any future controversy similar to that produced in arguing the King's divorce; and enacted that no person shall from henceforth marry within those degrees. The clause thus reads:—

'Since many inconveniences have fallen, as well within this Realm as in others, by reason of marrying within the Degrees of Marriage prohibited by God's laws, that is to say, the Son to marry the mother, or the step-mother, the Brother the Sister, the Father his Son's Daughter, or his Daughter's Daughter, or the Son to marry the Daughter of his Father procreate and born by his Step-mother, or the Son to marry his Aunt, being his Father's or Mother's Sister, or to marry his Uncle's Wife, or the Father to marry his Son's Wife, or the Brother to marry his Brother's Wife, or any man to marry his Wife's Daughter or his Wife's Son's Daughter, or his Wife's Daughter's Daughter, or his Wife's Sister; which Marriages, albeit they be plainly prohibited and detested by the laws of

'God, yet nevertheless, at some times they have proceeded under colours of dispensations by man's power, which is but usurped, and of right ought not to be granted, admitted, nor allowed; for no man, of what estate, degree, or condition soever he be, hath power to dispense with God's laws, as all the Clergy of this Realm in the said Convocations, and the most part of all the famous Universities of Christendom, and we also do affirm and think.—*Sect. 3.*... Be it therefore enacted.... that no person or persons subjects or residents of this Realm.... shall from henceforth marry *within the said Degrees* afore rehearsed.... And in case any person or persons.... hath been heretofore married.... *within any the Degrees above expressed*.... he separate from the bonds of such unlawful marriage, that then every such separation shall be good, lawful, firm and permanent for ever.... and that the children proceeding and procreate, under such unlawful marriage shall not be lawful nor legitimate.'—25 *Hen. VIII. c. 22. ss. 3, 4.*

\* \* DR. GIBSON, MR. CAY, and some other Ecclesiastical Lawyers, consider this Statute to be repealed by 28 *Hen. VIII. c. 7. s. 3*, and by 1 *Mar. Sess. 2. c. 1*; but MR. HAWKINS, LORD DENMAN, and others hold, that it remains still unrepealed.

Subsequently, HENRY VIII set aside his marriage with *Anne Boleyn*, and wedded *Lady Jane Seymour*, when another Act was passed (28 *Hen. VIII. c. 7*: A. D. 1536), which repealed the former Statute, 25 *Hen. VIII. c. 22*; and, after making void the marriage with *Anne*, limited the succession, first to the issue of the new Queen *Lady Jane*, and then to whom the King might nominate by will. In this Statute the same list of the *prohibited degrees* was retained as declared in 25 *Hen. VIII.*

\* \* This Act (28 *Hen. VIII*) however was repealed by 35 *Hen. VIII. c. 1*; also by 1 *Mar. Sess. 2. c. 1. s. 8*, and by 1 *Phil. & Mar. c. 8*. Yet VAUGHAN (*Vaugh. 224. 327.*) and VENTRIS, (2 *Vent. 18.*) in *Hill v. Good*, and *Harrison v. Burnwell*, held that in so far as the *prohibited degrees* were concerned, the Statute 28 *Hen. VIII.* was not repealed.

In the same year, another Act was passed (28 *Hen. VIII. c. 16 s. 2*) to get rid of Papal dispensations; and herein these Degrees were again enforced. But although this Act was repealed by 1 & 2 *Phil. & Mar. c. 8.*, yet it was revived by 1 *Eliz. c. 1. s. 10.*

A few years later (in A. D. 1540) an Act was passed (32 *Henry VIII. c. 38.*) setting aside other Papal dispensations, and the law of the Roman See that *pre-contracts* could make void a *de facto* Marriage; thus—'By reason of other prohibitions than God's law admitteth, for their lucre by that Court invented, the dispensations whereof they always reserved to themselves as in kindred or affinity between *cousin-germanes*, and so to fourth and fourth degree, carnal knowledge of any of the same kin, or affinity before in such outward degrees, which else were lawful, and be not prohibited by God's law, and all because they would get money by it.... be it therefore enacted.... that from July 1st, 1540, all and every such Marriages as within this Church of England shall be contracted between lawful persons (as by this Act we declare all persons to be lawful that be not prohibited by God's law to marry).... shall be.... deemed, judged and taken to be lawful, good, just and indissoluble,

'notwithstanding any pre-contract or pre-contracts of matrimony &c....and that no reservation or prohibition, *God's law except*, shall trouble or impeach any marriage *without the Levitical degrees.*'—32 *Hen.* VIII. c. 38. s. 2.

\* \* The clauses of this Act relating to *Pre-contracts* were repealed by 2 & 3 *Edw.* VI. c. 23: and although the entire Statute was repealed by 1 & 2 *Phil. & Mar.* c. 8. s. 19, yet the portion of 32 *Hen.* VIII. left unrepealed by 2 & 3 *Edw.* VI. was revived by 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. s. 11.

The limitation to the 4th degree was, as before observed (in page 750), the rule of the Church of England; and the prohibition was similarly restricted by the 4th *Council of Lateran* A. D. 1215. Previously, however, the Canon Law extended the prohibition to the 7th degree (*Caus.* 35. q. 2. 3. c. 1, 20, 21.), as it was also anciently maintained in the Church of England at the Council of London. (2 *SPEL.* 8; See also *BACON'S Abr.*).

In the next reign, EDWARD VI. repealed the enactments of 32 *Hen.* VIII. c. 38, bearing upon *Pre-contracts*—'Provided that in all other causes, and other things therein mentioned the said Act do staud in force.'—2 & 3 *Edw.* VI. c. 23. s. 4. A. D. 1548.

And in the Royal *Injunctions* of this reign, the question is twice put:—'Whether you know any to be married *within the Degrees prohibited* by the laws of God?'—*CARDWELL'S Doc. Ann.* l. 50, 79.

DR. BURN, after referring to the above Acts, adds:—'The *Degrees* specified in these Statutes are particularly set forth in *Leviticus* xviii, whereby not only degrees of kindred and consanguinity, but degrees of affinity and alliance do hinder Matrimony.'—(*Ecel. L. Phil.* ii. 440; *STEPHENS' Laws Rel. to Cl.* 712; *ib.* *Eccl. Statutes* 271.) Then is quoted by these writers LORD COKE'S illustration of the *Degrees* above enumerated, as annexed:—

#### OF THE MAN'S PART.

##### *Degrees of Consanguinity.*

##### *Degrees of Affinity.*

A Man may not marry his

Mother.	Father's Wife.
Father's Sister.	Uncle's Wife.
Mother's Sister.	Father's Wife's Daughter.
Sister.	Brother's Wife.
Daughter.	Wife's Sister.
Daughter of his Son, or	Son's Wife or Wife's Daughter.
Daughter.	Daughter of his Wife's Son, or
	Daughter.

#### OF THE WOMAN'S PART.

##### *Degrees of Consanguinity.*

##### *Degrees of Affinity.*

A Woman may not marry her

Father.	Mother's Husband.
Father's Brother.	Aunt's Husband.
Mother's Brother.	Sister's Husband.
Brother.	Husband's Brother.
Son of her Son, or Daughter.	Son of her Husband's Son or
	Daughter.

Queen *Mary*, to make her title to the Crown good and indisputable, repealed all the statutes passed in the preceding reigns opposed to her legitimacy and right of succession (by 1 *Mar.* Sess. 2. c. 1. A. D. 1553); and such likewise as militated against the Papal Supremacy (by 1 *Phil. & Mar.* c. 8. A. D. 1554); yet their intention was not to disturb the question of the *prohibited degrees* as laid down in 25 *Hen.* VIII; 28 *Hen.* VIII; 32 *Hen.* VIII; and 35 *Hen.* VIII; which have been cited above. This may be supposed from *Cardinal POLE* inquiring in his Visitation Articles in 1557:—‘Whether any be married in the degrees of affinity or consanguinity prohibited by the laws of Holy Church.’—*CARDWELL’S Doc. Ann.* i. 174.

On the accession of *Elizabeth*, an Act was passed (1 *Eliz.* c. 1. ss. 10, 11. A. D. 1558) repealing 1 & 2 *Phil. & Mar.* c. 8, consequently 28 *Hen.* VIII. c. 16. was revived, and of necessity so much of 28 *Hen.* VIII. c. 7, as was requisite for the right interpretation of 28 *Hen.* VIII. c. 16. By the same Statute (1 *Eliz.* c. 1.), the Act 32 *Hen.* VIII. c. 38. was also revived in so far as it related to the *Levitical Degrees*. Notwithstanding these enactments, the question continued, as at the very first, to be involved in considerable doubt and difficulty.

In the Visitation Articles at the beginning of this reign (1559) it is inquired:—‘Whether you know any to be married within the Degrees prohibited by the laws of God?’ *CARDWELL’S Doc. Ann.* i. 214.

In the *Lambeth Articles* of 1561 we also find:—‘It is agreed that all such marriages, as have been contracted *within the Levitical Degrees*, be dissolved, and namely those, who have married *two sisters one after another*, who are by common consent judged to be within the case.’—*ib.* i. 267.

*DR. CARDWELL* says:—‘It appears from a letter addressed by *ABP. CRANMER* to *LORD CROMWELL*, two years after the passing of the first Act (25 *Hen.* VIII.), that he suggested at the time, the necessity of introducing into the Statute many other instances not actually enumerated in *Leviticus*, but equally prohibited in principle. His words are:—“By the Law of God many persons be prohibited, which he not expressed, but he understood by like prohibition in equal degree. As *ST AMBROSE* saith, that the *Niece* is forbid by the Law of God, although it be not expressed in *Leviticus*, that the *Uncle* shall not marry his *Niece*. But when the *Nephew* is forbid there, that he shall not marry his *Aunt*, by the same is understood that the *Niece* shall not be married unto her *Uncle*. Likewise, as the *Daughter* is not there plainly expressed, yet when the *Son* is forbid to marry his *Mother*, it is understood that the *Daughter* may not be married to her *Father*, because they be of like degree”.... And as touching the Act of Parliament concerning the *Degrees prohibited* by God’s law, they be not so plainly set forth as I would they were. Wherein I somewhat spake my mind at the making of the said law, but it

---

\* This is similarly stated in the ‘*Reformatio Legum*’ (*De Gradibus. cap.* 3. p. 47.).

"was not then accepted." (STRYPE'S *Cranmer* i. 66.) These views, and the frequent applications made to the Archbishop for dispensations in cases prohibited in principle but not forbidden by express words in the *Statute*, led eventually to the formation of '*The Table of Degrees*' that was set forth by ABP. PARKER'.... in the first instance in 1560 (STRYPE'S *Ann.* i. P. 1. 332); and which subsequently (in 1563) was ordered by him to be printed and set up in the Churches of his province of Canterbury. (STRYPE'S *Parker* i. 556.)—*Doc. Ann.* i. 282.

In 1561. BP. JEWEL also expressed his opinion on the marriage of a *Wife's Sister*, which, says DR. CARDWELL, 'has been more disputed than others, inasmuch as the instance actually expressed in *Leviticus* merely forbids the having *two sisters* at the same time; but it is clearly one of the cases prohibited in principle, or as BP JEWEL stated the case in a letter dated Cal. Nov. 1561:— "Albeit I be not forbidden by plain words to marry my *wife's sister*, yet am I forbidden so to do by other words, which by exposition are plain enough. For when God commands me, "I shall not marry my *brother's wife*, it follows directly by the same, that he forbids me to marry my *wife's sister*. For between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers is like analogy or proportion." (STRYPE'S *Parker.* i. p. 222; iii. p. 57.)—*Doc. Ann.* i. 283. Also quoted in GIBSON'S *Codex* 412; BURN'S *Eccles. L.* Phil. ii. 448.

ABP. PARKER'S TABLE has from that day been considered to be declaratory of the law as to the *Prohibited Degrees*. The principles on which it was drawn out, as we learn from Dr. Cardwell, were:—(1) That the *Degrees* which are laid down as to *Men* will hold equally as to *Women* in the same proximity. (2) That the *Husband* and *Wife* are but one flesh; so that he who is related to the one by Consanguinity is related to the other by Affinity in the same degree. (*Reformatio Legum.* De Grad. cap. 4. p. 48; GIBS. *Cod.* 412.)—*Doc. Ann.* i. 283.

Among the preliminary admonitions prefixed to *Parker's TABLE* were:—

'I. It is to be noted, that those persons which be in the direct line ascendant, cannot marry together, although they are never so far asunder in degree.'

'II. It is also to be noted, that consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving Matrimony) is contracted as well in them and by them, which be of kindred by the one side, as in and by them which be kindred by both sides.

'III. Item, that by the laws consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving Matrimony) is contracted as well by unlawful company of man and woman, as by lawful marriage.

'VIII. Item, who shall presume to contract in the degrees prohibited, (though he do it ignorantly), besides that the fruit of such copulation may be judged unlawful, is also punishable at the Ordinary's discretion.

'IX. Item, if any Minister shall conjoin any such; or shall be present at such contracts making; he ought to be suspended from his Ministry for three years, and otherwise to be punished according to the laws.'

"None shall come near to any of the kindred of his flesh  
 "to uncover their shame: I am the Lord." 'Levit. xviii. 6.'—  
 Then follows the annexed Table:—

## A TABLE OF KINDRED AND AFFINITY,

WHEREIN WHOSOEVER ARE RELATED ARE FORBIDDEN IN SCRIP-  
 TURE AND OUR LAWS TO MARRY TOGETHER.

A MAN may not marry his		A WOMAN may not marry with her	
1 GRANDMOTHER,	<i>con.</i>	1 GRANDFATHER,	<i>con.</i>
2 Grandfather's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	2 Grandmother's Husband,	<i>aff.</i>
3 Wife's Grandmother.	<i>aff.</i>	3 Husband's Grandfather,	<i>aff.</i>
4 Father's Sister,	<i>con.</i>	4 Father's Brother,	<i>con.</i>
5 Mother's Sister,	<i>con.</i>	5 Mother's Brother,	<i>con.</i>
6 Father's Brother's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	6 Father's Sister's Husb.	<i>aff.</i>
7 Mother's Brother's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	7 Mother's Sister's Husb.	<i>aff.</i>
8 Wife's Father's Sister,	<i>aff.</i>	8 Husband's Father's Br.	<i>aff.</i>
9 Wife's Mother's Sister.	<i>aff.</i>	9 Husband's Mother's Br.	<i>aff.</i>
10 Mother,	<i>con.</i>	10 Father,	<i>con.</i>
11 Step-Mother,	<i>aff.</i>	11 Step-Father,	<i>aff.</i>
12 Wife's Mother.	<i>aff.</i>	12 Husband's Father,	<i>aff.</i>
13 Daughter,	<i>con.</i>	13 Son,	<i>con.</i>
14 Wife's Daughter,	<i>aff.</i>	14 Husband's Son,	<i>aff.</i>
15 Son's Wife.	<i>aff.</i>	15 Daughter's Husband.	<i>aff.</i>
16 Sister,	<i>con.</i>	16 Brother,	<i>con.</i>
17 Wife's Sister,	<i>aff.</i>	17 Husband's Brother,	<i>aff.</i>
18 Brother's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	18 Sister's Husband.	<i>aff.</i>
19 Son's Daughter,	<i>con.</i>	19 Son's Son,	<i>con.</i>
20 Daughter's Daughter,	<i>con.</i>	20 Daughter's Son,	<i>con.</i>
21 Son's Son's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	21 Son's Daughter's Hbd.	<i>aff.</i>
22 Daughter's Son's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	22 Daughter's Dghr's Husb.	<i>aff.</i>
23 Wife's Son's Daughter,	<i>aff.</i>	23 Husband's Son's Son,	<i>aff.</i>
24 Wife's Daughter's Dghtr.	<i>aff.</i>	24 Husband's Daughter's Sn.	<i>aff.</i>
25 Brother's Daughter,	<i>con.</i>	25 Brother's Son,	<i>con.</i>
26 Sister's Daughter,	<i>con.</i>	26 Sister's Son,	<i>con.</i>
27 Brother's Son's Wife.	<i>aff.</i>	27 Brother's Daughter's Hbd.	<i>aff.</i>
28 Sister's Son's Wife,	<i>aff.</i>	28 Sister's Daughter's Hbd.	<i>aff.</i>
29 Wife's Brother's Dghtr.	<i>aff.</i>	29 Husband's Brother's Son,	<i>aff.</i>
30 Wife's Sister's Daughter,	<i>aff.</i>	30 Husband's Sister's Son.	<i>aff.</i>

—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 282—286; SPARROW'S *Coll.* 258—262;  
 BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil.* ii. 442.

In 1563-4 We find it also enjoined in the '*Book of Advertisements*':—'*Item*, That no persons be suffered to marye within the '*Leviticall Degrees* mentioned in a TABLE, set forth by the Arche-bysshoppe of Caunterburie in that behalfe, A. D. 1563; and if any suche be, to be separated by order of lawe.'—(*ib.* i. 294.)

In the *Reformatio Legum* (1549—1571), CRANMER says, in addition to what we have already adduced:—'*Non solum istas maritis adhuc superstitibus disjungi personas quas diximus, sed etiam illis mortuis idem perpetuo valere. Quemadmodum enim horribile flagitium est in vita patris, fratris, patruī, aut avunculi, audere illorum uxores violare, sic post mortem illorum matrimonium cum illis contrahere parem turpitudinem habet.*'—*De Gradibus in Matr. Prohib. cap. 6. p. 49.*

In 1571. The CANONS of that period also enforced PARKER's *Table of Degrees*, observing:—'*Omnia Matrimonia, quæ uspiam contracta sunt intra gradus cognationis aut affinitatis prohibitos in 18 Levitici, auctoritate Episcopi dissolventur: maxime vero, si quis, priore uxore demortua, ejus sororem uxorem duxerit: hic enim gradus communi doctorum virorum consensu et judicio putatur in Levitico prohiberi. Non licebit cuiquam Matrimonium contrahere inter illos gradus, qui in Tabulâ a reverendissimo patre domino Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, in eum usum scripta et publica prohibentur.*'—SPARROW'S *Coll.* p. 240.

We arrive next at the authorities of force at the present day, viz; the CANONS of 1603-4, and the Statute, 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54, to which we have already referred (*supra* p. 749.)

It may now be concluded from these observations;—(1) That the *Levitical law* is the declared interpreter of the CANON, and STATUTE LAW: (2) that prohibitions of Marriage to Collaterals are within the 3rd degree inclusive, both in consanguinity and affinity: and (3) that there are no prohibitions to such as stand in the 4th degree: so that, to relations who are in the 4th degree, or beyond it, the liberty of contracting Marriage is open; with this exception, however, that relations in the *direct line*, however remote the degree may be, are *not permitted* to contract Marriage.

The same rule holds with respect to *illegitimate relations*. LORD STOWELL observed in *Horner v. Horner*:—'*According to the general policy of the law in matters merely moral, a person is said to be restrained from marriage with illegitimate relations as much as with legitimate ones, because the rules of prohibition of marriage arise out of natural relations....taking it to be sufficiently settled, as I conceive it is, that moral restraints do attach upon natural consanguinity.* (1 Consist. 352, 353.)'

—BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil.* ii. 450; CRIPP'S *Laws Rel. to Ch. & Cl.* 640; ROGER'S *Eccl. L.* 636; STEPHEN'S *Laws Rel. to Cl.* 713. n; HUBBACK *on Succession.* 275. (See also *Thorpe* (or *Blackmore*) v. *Bridger*, 2 Phil. 359, 361; *Woods v. Woods.* 2 Curt. 521; *Haynes v. Jeffet.* (or *Jeffreys*) 1 Ld. Raym. 68; *Reg. v. Chafin.* 3 Salk. 66; *Rex. v. Hodnett.* (*Inhab.*) 1 T. R. 96.

Marriages contracted *within* the Levitical degrees fall under the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which are the proper judges of incest; those which are contracted *without* the Levitical degrees are under the cognizance of the temporal Courts. Should the spiritual Courts exceed their jurisdiction, which has been limited by the Statutes of the Realm, they will be restrained by a prohibition from the temporal Courts. (Vaugh. 206; Bacon's Abr.)

Marriage with a *deceased wife's sister* having been one of the most controverted cases, we will quote, by way of conclusion, a few observations from the judgment in the celebrated cause of *Regina. v. Chadwich*, heard in the court of Queen's Bench, 1847.

LORD DENMAN observed:—'The only question is, whether that marriage is void by the law of England.... This depends entirely upon the statute 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54.' (After quoting the sections we have already given in p. 749, he proceeds:—).... 'Now it appears to me,—indeed it is universally admitted, that (a marriage *within* the prohibited degrees) depends entirely upon the meaning and effect of 32 Hen. VIII. c. 38'.... (He then quotes the clause of 25 Hen. VIII. specifying the prohibited degrees, and adds).... 'If that Act of Parliament is in force it decides the present case. It was however repealed by an Act of the 28th of the same King. . . but in this (last) statute the same list of prohibited marriages is included.... Afterward, in the 32nd year of Henry VIII. the Act passed to which we have been particularly referred. The second of these Acts (28 Hen. VIII.), however, is repealed in the first year of Queen MARY'S reign.... I think that the prohibition declared by those Acts (25 Hen. VIII. and 28 Hen. VIII.) to be the prohibition of God's law is left wholly untouched by this particular Act (32 Hen. VIII.) with regard to pre-contracts.... I come to an undoubting opinion that the *prohibitory degrees* are authoritatively laid down in these two statutes (25 Hen. VIII; 28 Hen. VIII.), and that the marriage is therefore made void by the 2nd Section of 5 & 6 Will. IV. referring to the then state of the law'.... (After referring to ABP. PARKER'S *Table* put forth in 1563, and to the CANONS of 1603-4, he goes on to say).... 'In 1563, therefore, about 20 years after the passing of 32 Hen. VIII. this law was promulgated in a most remarkable manner, and brought to the knowledge of every individual who could read. And then, in 1603, this was declared law, having been, in 1563, so considered



'and so proclaimed.... LORD COKE in the second Institute (p. 683). 'writes a commentary upon the statute of 32 Hen. VIII. and he 'never insinuates that the repeal of those former particular 'statutes with reference to the succession to the Crown repealed 'the *Table of Prohibited Degrees*. On the contrary, he states 'what the prohibited degrees are in the very words of those Acts '.... I therefore am of opinion that the judgment which was given 'is perfectly right, because a party cannot be guilty of the crime of 'bigamy for contracting a second marriage, when the former one 'was in point of fact null, and in the very language of the law was 'void, to all intents and purposes.'—*Justice COLERIDGE*, WIGHTMAN, and ERLE, held the same opinion. (*CRIPPS' Eccl. Cases* 32; 10 *Law Times*. 155; 12 *Jurist*. 174; *STEPHEN'S L. Rel. to Cl.* 1470; *WADDILOVE'S Digest*. 245.).—See also *Hill v. Good*. *Gibs*. 412; *Vaugh.* 302; 3 *Keb.* 166; *Kay v. Sherwood*. 1 *Curt.* 195, 199.—201; 1 *More. P. C. C.* 353; *Chick. v. Ramsdale* 1 *Curt.* 34; *Collet. v. Collet. Skin.* 37; *Faremouth. v. Watson*. 1 *Phil.* 355; *Hinks v. Harris. Carth.* 271.

\*.\* Among other cases of prohibitions to the marriage contract as being within the *Levitical Degrees*, the Reader may be referred for further information to the following:—(1) Marriage with a *Wife's Sister's Daughter*: See *Ellerton v. Gastrell*. 1 *Comyn.* 318; *Snowling v. Nursey*. 2 *Lutw.* 1075; *Worthy v. Watkinson*. 2 *Lev.* 254; 3 *Keb.* 600; *Massey's case*, *Strype's Cranmer* 46; *Gibs*. 412, 413; *Remington's case in Howard v. Bartlet.* *Hob.* 181;—(2) Marriage with a *Wife's Daughter* by a former Husband: See *Blackmore v. Brider*. 2 *Phil.* 360.—(3) Marriage with the *Sister of former wife's Mother*: See *Regina v. Madden*. 1 *Inst. Circ. Rep.* 731.—(4) Marriage with a *Niece*: See *Burgess. v. Burgess*. 1 *Consist.* 392; *Hames v. Jescott.* (or *Jephcott*) *Gibs*. 413; *Ld. Raym.* 68; 1 *Consist.* 353; 5 *Mod.* 170; 3 *Salk.* 66; *Watkinson v. Mergatron.* *Sir T. Raym.* 464; *Woods v. Woods*. 2 *Curt.* 529.—(5). So also a Marriage with a *first Husband's Brother*: See *Aughtie v. Aughtie*. 1 *Phil.* 202.—(6) But a marriage with the *Wife of deceased Great Uncle* is said not to be within the prohibited degrees. See *Harrison v. Burnell.* *Vaugh.* 206; 2 *Vent.* 9; *Hill. v. Good.* *Vaugh.* 302.

Consult also the annexed authorities from which the chief of the above remarks have been gathered, viz:—*BURN'S Eccl. Law.* *Phil.* ii. 439—451; *CRIPP'S Laws of Ch. & Clergy*. 638—641; *LAW'S Eccl. Statutes*. iii. 257—336; *ROGER'S Eccl. Law*. 635—637; *STEPHEN'S Laws Rel. to Church*. 710—723; *ib. Statutes* 269—273; *WADDILOVE'S Digest. of Eccl. Cases*. 245—246; and the various *Ecclesiastical Reports* referred to. But for the arguments advocating the repeal of 5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 54., see *Serjeant MANNING'S* elaborate pamphlet, entitled '*Observations on the Debate in the House of Lords, &c., on Marriages within the Prohibited Degrees.*' 1s. 6d. Benning. 1854.

*The Ten-Commandments.*

The *Ten-Commandments* are usually seen written up at the east end of our Churches, or Chancels, in accordance with the requirements of the 82nd CANON (of 1603-4). This is the only authority enjoining the practice, and it is still binding upon the Clergy, and of course upon the Ecclesiastical officers of the Ordinary, the Churchwardens.

The CANON, after giving certain directions with respect to the 'Communion-Table,' thus proceeds:—

'....We appoint, that &c....and that the *Ten-Commandments* be set up on the *East end of every Church and Chapel*, where the people may best see and read the same; and other &c....All these to be done at the charge of the Parish.'—CANON 82.

\* \* Our Writers on Ecclesiastical Law transcribe this injunction thus:—'CAN. 82. The *Ten-Commandments* shall be set up at the charge of the Parish, upon the east end of every Church and Chapel.' &c.—BURN'S *Eccl. L. Phil.* i. 371; C. G. PRIDEAUX'S *Chw. Guide.* 45; ROGERS' *Eccl. L.* 156; STEER'S *Par. L.* Clive. 35; STEPHENS' *Law Rel. to Cl.* 288. MR. CRIPPS, however, adds the following remark:—'But as it is very possible that in many Churches they could not easily be read or seen by the people, if set up at the east end, it is presumed that they may be, as they frequently are, set up elsewhere in the body of the Church, where they may be more easily read.' (p. 418.)—*Laws Rel. to the Ch. & the Clergy.*

The custom of setting up the '*Ten Commandments*' appears to have had its origin in the time of *Elizabeth*; as we may gather from the following evidences; where we shall also find, that by the expression, 'on the east end of the Church or Chapel,' is implied *the east end of the Chancel*: thus—

In 1560. ELIZABETH writes to her Ecclesiastical Commissioners, ABP. PARKER, and others, directing them:—'Amongst other things to order, that the *Tables of the Commandments* may be comlye set, or hung up in the *east end of the Chauncell*, to be not only read for edification, but also to give some comlye ornament and demonstration, that the same is a place of religion and prayer.'—CARDWELL'S *Doc. Ann.* i. 262; STRYPE'S *Parker.* iii. p. 46. *App.* xv.

In 1561. In the *Orders*, taken the 10th day of October in the third year of *Elizabeth*, we have the following:—‘And further, that there be fixed upon the wall, over the said Communion-Board, the *Tables* of God’s precepts, imprinted for the said purpose. Provided yet that in Cathedral Churches the *Tables* of the said precepts be more largely and costly painted out, to the better shew of the same.’ (ii. 361. n.)—HEYLYN, comparing this Order with the like injunction in the “*Book of Advertisements*” of 1564 (see *infra*), concludes,—‘That the *Communion-Table* was “to stand above the steps, and under the *Commandments*; and, therefore, all along the wall on which the *Ten Commandments* were appointed to be placed: which was directly where the *Altar* had stood before.” (ib. 363.).’—HEYLYN’S *Hist. of Ref.* E. H. S.; *British Mag.* Oct. 1848.

In 1564. The ‘*Book of Advertisements*,’ from which our present CANONS are chiefly derived, after speaking with respect to the Communion-Table, adds:—‘And to sett the *Tenne Commaundmentes* upon the easte walle over the said Table.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 292.

WILLIAMS (*Bp. of Lincoln*, ob. 1650.), in his argument against HEYLYN, thus explains the position described in the above injunction:—‘To be fixed on the *east wall*, over the Communion-Board, can signify nothing else but that they should be fixed higher than the Communion-Table, upon some part of the east wall, so as the people, seeing the Communion-Table, might over that see and read the *Ten-Commandments*.’ (p. 43.)—*Holy Table*.

In the present day there is great difference of opinion with regard to the position of the ‘*Ten-Commandments*.’ Some, adhering to the strict letter of the CANON, object to their appearance on the east wall of the Chancel: others, referring to the Injunctions of Elizabeth, and the usages of that time, as expositors of the CANON, insist with equal tenacity upon the ‘*Commandments*’ occupying that position. Again, there are many Clergymen who display the ‘*Commandments*’ in small rubricated letters of Lombardic character within canopied recesses behind the *Communion-Table*, where they form a decoration of the

---

\* In a Note is added by the Editor:—‘Comp. *Cypr. Anglie.* p. 20. The words of the *Order*, and HEYLYN’S reasoning on them, are inconsistent with the notion which has of late been very confidently propounded,—that the Elizabethan Reformers intended to place the ‘*Commandments*’ in the Chancel-arch, as a substitute for the images which they removed from the Screen.’—HEYLYN’S *Ref.* E. H. S. ii. 363. n.

*Reredos* :\* while others, adopting the ordinary plain Roman text, arrange them conspicuously in two '*Tables*' over the Communion Table. Where, however, a diversity of opinion prevails the dictum of the Ordinary has the power of settling the dispute; and he may also prohibit their being removed from the place they have customarily occupied. In fact, the '*Table of Commandments*' cannot be obliterated, or taken down, without the permission of the Ecclesiastical Superior, expressed by a '*Faculty*,' or otherwise.

In the '*INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA*' it is stated:—There 'is no authority for placing the *Table of Commandments* at the east end of the Chancel.'—PLATE 67.

The *Tract*, a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," when speaking of the *Reredos*, writes:—'The *Reredos*, *Dossel*, or *Altar-screen*, IS AN ORNAMENT, it cannot be too often repeated, FIT ONLY FOR A LARGE CHURCH. It should seldom be erected in a modern building, and then should be of stone: and wherever it is adopted, *there must be no niches*, unless there are figures. '*Reredoses for the Commandments are intolerable*. Perhaps more money has been wasted on *Dossels* than on any other ornament of Churches. A very simple *Reredos*....may be allowed for the '*candlesticks*.' (p. 14.)—Published by "The Cambridge Camden Society."

In the *Tract*, a 'FEW WORDS TO CHURCHWARDENS' the annexed remarks follow the citation of the 82nd CANON:—'They (*The Commandments*) ought not to be seen, as they often are, in other parts of the Church. Whenever they want renewing, if renewed at all, they should be painted in large black letters, with all those letters in *red*, which are printed in Capitals in the Prayer Book: this is called *rubricating*, and it gives them a handsome look.' (p. 9.)—PART. I. Pub. by the *Ecclesiological Society*.

---

\* A *Reredos* is defined in the '*GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE*' as—'The wall or screen at the back of an Altar, Seat, &c.; it was usually ornamented with panelling, &c., especially behind an Altar, and sometimes was enriched with a profusion of niches, buttresses, pinnacles, statues, and other decorations, which were often painted with brilliant colours; *Reredoses* of this kind not unfrequently extended across the whole breadth of the Church, and were sometimes carried up nearly to the ceiling. In village Churches they were generally simple, and appear very frequently to have had no Ornaments formed in the wall, though sometimes corbels or niches were provided to carry Images, and sometimes that part of the wall immediately over the Altar was panelled. It was not unusual to decorate the wall at the back of an Altar with panelling, &c., in wood, or with embroidered hangings of tapestry work to which the name of *Reredos* was given.' (p. 305).—4th Edition.

*Terrier.*

A TERRIER, from the French *terre*, and Latin *terra*, is a written survey of the lands, houses, and other possessions of a Benefice, including an account of the temporal rights of the Church, and of the Parish. Although a *Terrier* is seldom called for in these days, yet it is required by the CANON (87th), and is still an important document. It is directed to be carefully preserved in the Bishop's Registry, from which a copy may at any time be procured: indeed an official transcript should be kept in the Parish-Chest for the convenience of reference. (GODB. Appen. 12.). The CANON runs thus:—

'We ordain that the Archbishops and all Bishops within their  
'several Dioceses shall procure (as much as in them lieth) that  
'a true *Note* and *Terrier* of all the Glebes, lands, meadows,  
'gardens, orchards, houses, stocks, implements, tenements, and  
'portions of tithes, lying out of their Parishes (which belong to  
'any Parsonage, or Vicarage, or rural Prebend) be taken by the  
'view of honest men in every Parish, by the appointment of the  
'Bishop (whereof the Minister to be one), and be laid up in the  
'Bishop's Registry, there to be for a perpetual memory thereof.'  
—CANON 87.

Where no *Terrier* exists, or when it has been lost, or mislaid, a new survey of the glebe lands, &c. should carefully be made, and all rights, privileges, and customary dues be clearly and fully described in it. This should be properly attested by the Incumbent, and chief Parishioners, and be transmitted to the Registry of the Diocese.

With regard to the authority of a *Terrier* as evidence in a Court of law, we may quote the following opinions:—

DR. BURN writes:—'These *Terriers* are of greater authority in  
'the Ecclesiastical Courts than they are in the temporal; for the  
'Ecclesiastical Courts are not allowed to be Courts of Record;  
'and yet even in the temporal Courts these *Terriers* are of some  
'weight, when duly attested by the Register, (*Johnson* 242.);  
'especially if they be signed, not only by the Parson and Church-  
'wardens, but also by the substantial inhabitants; but if they be  
'signed by the Parson only, they can be no evidence for him; so

'neither (as it seemeth), if they be signed only by the Parson and Churchwardens, if the Churchwardens are of his nomination. But in all cases they are certainly strong evidence against the Parson. (*Miller v. Foster*. K. Bench, 1794: but contrary to the opinion of Macdonald Ch. B. 1 Anstr. 387: see also *Athyns v. Hatton*. ib.). *Terriers*, though signed by the Churchwardens only, are admissible as evidence, and they are also admissible against the Rector, though signed by none claiming under or acting for him. (*Illingworth v. Leigh* 4 Gwill. 1615)'—BURN'S *Eccle. L. Phil.* iii. 673.

*Terriers* are considered the strongest evidence against those signing them, almost paramount to usage: (*Drake v. Smith*. 5 Pri. R. 380.): but not conclusive, (*Blundell v. Maudsley*, 15 East. 641; *Lake v. Skinner*, 1 J. & W. K. 20.).

The *originals* must be produced, for *copies*, although the originals may be lost, are held inadmissible in evidence (*Leathes v. Hewett*. 4 Pri. R. 364): yet a *copy* from the Parish Registry was admitted, as the original could not be found. (*Athyns v. Hatton*. Gwill. 1406; 2 Anstr. 386.).

*Terriers* ought to be deposited in the Bishop's Registry (*Miller v. Foster*. Gwill. 1406); and by such deposit, being thus restored to the Bishop, they become *Terriers*. (*Potts v. Durant*. 3 Anstr. 789.). There are three acknowledged legal repositories of *Terriers*, and of Rector's and Vicar's Books; viz.—the Registry of the Bishop, and of the Archdeacon, and the Church Chest. (*Armstrong v. Hewitt*, 4 Pri. R. 216.).

A *Terrier* without other evidence is not sufficient to establish a 'modus.' (*Lake v. Skinner*, 1 Jac. & W. 9. 20.).

MR. C. G. PRIDEAUX (*Barrister-at-Law*) says:—The Churchwardens 'ought also, at the cost of the Parish, to provide .... a true *Note* and *Terrier* of all the Glebe lands, and other possessions belonging to the Church.' (p. 47).—*Churchwardens' Guide*.

A *Form of Terrier* is given in full in BURN'S *Ecclesiastical Law*. (Phil. iii. 673): we can, however, only give here a few heads, so as to afford some idea of the nature of the *items* contained in a *Terrier*.

#### *Form of a Terrier.*

'A true *Note* and *Terrier* of all the Glebes, lands, &c.... improvements, tenements, portions of Tithes, and other rights, belonging to the Vicarage and Parish Church of *Orton*, &c.... now in the use and possession of RICHARD BURN, Clerk, Vicar, &c., taken, made, and renewed according to the old evidences and knowledge of the ancient inhabitants, this 10th day of *November*, 1749, &c.... by the appointment of the Right Reverend Father in God *Richard*, Lord Bishop of *Carlisle*, at his primary Visitation held at *Appleby*, &c....'

*Imprimis*, One slated dwelling House in length 51 feet, in breadth 19 feet, within the walls. One thatched Barn, &c. &c.  
*Item*, The CHURCHYARD, containing 3 roods, 19 perches, adjoining to the grounds of, &c. the Walls and Gates thereof round about, made by the Parish. *Item*, one enclosure, &c. &c. &c.  
*Item*, to the said Vicarage is also belonging the tithe of Wool throughout the Parish; and the manner of tithing is this: the owner, &c. .... *Item*, the tithe of Lambs, &c. .... *Item*, the tithe of Geese, &c. .... *Item*, the tithe of Pigs, &c. .... *Item*, the tithe of Eggs, &c. .... *Item*, by every person who sows hemp is paid yearly one penny. *Item*, for each plough, &c. .... *Item*, by every person keeping Bees, &c. .... *Item*, an oblation of 4 pence at every Churching of Women. *Item*, for every Wedding by publication of Banns, 1s.; by Licence, 10s. *Item*, for every Funeral, without a Sermon, 6 pence. *Item*, Mortuaries according to Act of Parliament. *Item*, for every person of age to Communicate, 1½d. yearly, due at Easter. *Item*, a pension of 20s. yearly out of the Rectory of Sedbergh, in the county of York. The Glebe, Tithes, and profits of the Vicarage are worth, at the improved value, *communibus annis*, about £90. a year. There is also due to the PARISH CLERK, for every family keeping a separate fire, 3 pence yearly; for every Wedding by publication, or by Licence, 1s.: for every Funeral, 6 pence; for every Proclamation in the Church-yard, 2 pence. To the SEXTON for making a Grave, 6 pence.

Belonging to the said Parish are, first, the PARISH-CHURCH, an ancient building, containing in length, &c. &c. Within, and belonging to which are one Communion-Table, with a covering for the same of green cloth; also one linen cloth for the same, &c. &c. .... The seats in the Church and Chancel (except the Vicar's Pew) have been repaired for time immemorial at the public expence of the Parish. There are also several new common seats &c. &c. .... There is also belonging to the said Parish, the Rectory thereof, together with the tithes, &c. .... Also the advowson of the Vicarage, &c. .... Also one Box with three locks, in the keeping of John Unthank of Orton; in which are the purchase Deeds of the Rectory, &c. &c. .... There is also belonging to the said Parish, one Inclosure in, &c. &c. .... Also the sum of £20. in the hands of, &c. &c. .... Also the sum of £3 ancient Poor Stock, &c. &c. .... The interest of which money, and the rent of which Inclosure, are applied by the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor, &c. to the relief of the Poor, and defraying other Parish charges, &c. &c. ....

There are also three Schools in the said Parish. One at, &c. &c. Another school at, &c. &c. .... Another at, &c. &c. ....

In testimony of the truth of the before mentioned particulars, and of any of them, We, the Minister, Churchwardens, and principal inhabitants, have set our hands, the 10th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1749.

‘R. BURN, Vicar.’

‘JOSEPH POWLEY,	}	Churchwardens.’
&c. &c.		
‘JOHN UNTHANK,	}	Names of Inhabitants.’
&c. &c.		

## Vestry Furniture, &amp;c. &amp;c.

In addition to the 'Ornaments and Goods of the Church' we have already described, there are a few others of minor importance for which there is no law, or authority, requiring that they should be provided; and they are therefore left to the option of the Churchwardens; subject, however, to the control of the Vestry, and to the consent of the Ordinary. These are items more of convenience, comfort, or of taste, than of necessity; such as *Hearse-Cloths*, *Pulpit-Cloths*, *Vestry-Furniture*, *Mats*, *Stoves*, *Brushes*, *Lamps*, *Candlesticks*, and the like.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAWYERS lay down this general rule:—'There are *many other Articles* for which no provision is made by any *special law*, and therefore must be referred to 'the general power of the CHURCHWARDENS, with the consent of 'the major part of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled, and 'under the direction of the Ordinary: such as the erecting *Galleries*, adding new *Bells*, (and of consequence, as it seemeth, 'Salaries for the *Ringers*), *Organs*, *Clock*, *Chimes*, *King's Arms*, 'Pulpit-Cloths, *Hearse Cloths*, *Rushes* or *Mats*, *Vestry Furniture*, and such like.'—BURN'S *Ecc. L. Phil.* i. 373. a; CRIPPS' *Laws Rel. to Ch. and Cl.* 419; STEER'S *Par. L. Clive.* 37; STEPHENS' *Laws Rel. to Cl.* 292. Also quoted in DR. HOOK'S *Church. Dict.* Art. "ORNAMENTS."

From this, it may be concluded, that neither the Minister, Churchwardens, nor the Ordinary, have power in themselves, individually, or collectively, to enforce upon the Parish the provision of the Goods above enumerated. The supply therefore of these minor things is dependent upon the consent of the Vestry, the liberality of the Incumbent, or upon voluntary contributions. We may, here refer to two items, which are not often touched upon; viz:—the *Hearse-Cloth* or *Funeral-Pall*, and *Cloth of mourning*. With regard to the former, we will annex one opinion:—

'The *Parish Pall* is as much the property of the Church as the 'Vestments of the Altar, or the Pulpit hangings, and therefore 'ought to be at the service of any Parishioner. This, for the 'Poor, will be a matter of great importance; the *hire* of the mean-



'est *Pall* sent to the Union is *five shillings*; and, perhaps, such an 'oue as the labourer, well to do in the world, would select for his 'wife and child, would not cost less than *ten*. A tradesman in the 'country, making any pretensions to 'respectability,' would be 'charged a guinea. Now if a good *Cloth Pall* belonged to the 'Church, all this hire would be saved; while if any Parishioner 'chose to use one of richer materials, nothing hinders him from 'hiring it; or, better still, making it, and presenting it to the 'Church.... We have given an example of a *Pall* at PLATE 63. of 'the INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA.\*.... We lately had occasion to 'make both *Bier* and *Pall*, and we found the expense of both 'together amount to between £14, and £15. Here the material of 'the latter was cloth of 15s. a yard; the fringe was of yellow silk, '4in. deep. But Cathedrals, and rich Churches ought undoubtedly 'to have velvet *Palls*, with gold fringes.... It would also be very 'desirable that every Church should possess six or eight *mourning* 'Cloaks for the use of the poor. It would save them the expence 'of *Hat-bands* &c; and add a great degree of ritual dignity to 'the poorest Funeral.' (p. 18.)—*Funerals, and Funeral Arrangements*. Pub. by the 'ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.'

With respect to *Cloth of Mourning* placed round the Reading-Desk, Pulpit, or elsewhere in a Church, at the *Funeral* of a wealthy Parishioner; we may state, that the Incumbent's consent must be first obtained, and at the same time some arrangement made regarding the subsequent appropriation of the clothing; for if it should be put up without the knowledge or consent of the Incumbent, it will become his property as a matter of right: thus—

Judge BAYLEY decided in the *Margate* case:—'That as the 'frechold of the Church is in the Incumbent, *any mourning* placed 'therein *without* his knowledge would be his of right. If his consent 'is asked, he may make his own terms, or he may refuse altogether.' *Gents. Mag.* Jan. 1821; *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1834.

We have now gone through the various items coming under the designation of the '*Ornaments of the Church*,' and have been careful to distinguish such as may be optionally provided from those which are more imperatively required, and could be *legally*

---

\* It is thus described:—' *Funeral Palls* may be made of silk 'velvet, or cloth. Their colour ought to be *blue* or *purple*: the 'Cross,' (which extends to the edge of the *Pall*) is made of the 'same material as the ground work, and ought to be *white*, or '*red*; the embroidery is in gold.'

demand. We have also shewn upon whom the responsibility lies of supplying the Ornaments which are absolutely necessary; as well as referred to the source whence the requisite funds are to be obtained. The *Churchwardens*, as we have seen, hold in this matter a very important position, which they derive from the circumstance of their standing in two capacities:—1st. as the *Officers* of the ORDINARY, whence their authority in respect of the choice and provision of the Ornaments; and 2ndly. as the *representatives* of the *Parish*, whence their command of the necessary funds. Any dereliction of duty, therefore, in the former respect would subject them to the ‘monition’ of the Bishop, and any extravagance in the latter, would make them amenable to the censure of the Parishioners in Vestry assembled. Yet, as they are a ‘*Corporation*,’ they cannot be *interfered with* while discharging the functions of their office, either by the Minister, or by the Parishioners: so that the remedy in case of any grievance is by ‘presentment’ or complaint to their Ecclesiastical Superior, or an appeal to a Court of law. When there is a want of the necessary funds, the *Churchwardens* are bound to make every attempt permitted by law to procure what may be needed.

DR. WADDILOVE states:—‘The CANONS 20, 58, 70, 82, 99, and others, direct what necessities and *Ornaments* are to be furnished ‘at the charge of the Parish. It is the duty of the *Churchwardens* ‘to provide articles necessary for the decent performance of Divine ‘Service, and *if they have not funds*, they are bound to take every ‘step they legally can to procure them. (*Cooper v. Wickham* ‘2 Curt. 312, 313.)’—*Digest of Eccl. Cases*. 104.

There is one other point—an important point—which calls for a remark before concluding our discussion, and that is, with respect to the power of *introducing* Goods or Ornaments into the Church, and of *taking away*, or *removing*, any that may already exist; particularly fixtures, such as the *Pulpit*, *Reading-Desk*, *Organ*, *Credence-Table*, &c. In these cases it is imperatively necessary that Incumbents and Churchwardens

anticipate, and provide against, every opposition and objection before attempting either proceeding, by acting solely and entirely under the legal sanction of a '*Faculty*.' Neither the consent of the majority of a Vestry Meeting, nor the permission either of the Archdeacon or of the Bishop, if given but verbally, can protect the party who shall introduce or remove any Ornament *without a Faculty* from a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court, should there be found even but one Parishioner sufficiently aggrieved to venture upon an action. The following recent case especially bears upon this question :—

The Churchwarden (Mr. PALK) of *St Sidwell's, Exeter*, made a Presentment to Archdeacon STEVENS at the Easter Visitation, 1854, against a *Credence-Table* which had lately been introduced into the Parish Church by the Incumbent (the Rev. J. L. GALTON); and 'enquired whether a *Credence-Table*, or any thing else, could be put up without the sanction of the Churchwardens? The Archdeacon replied that it could not; but the Presentment must go to a higher power. Mr. PALK asked if it was not in the power of the Churchwardens to get rid of the *Credence-Table*, as they had never given their sanction to its being put up.... The Archdeacon said they had. Mr. PALK then called attention to the *Flowers* and *Festoons*, which were put up in the Church at Easter without the sanction of the Churchwardens, and asked if that was legal? The Archdeacon said they had no business to be put up without the sanction of the Wardens.'—(*The Guardian*, June 8, 1854.) Shortly after, 'Mr. PALK very courteously intimated to the Rev. Mr. GALTON that his *Credence-Table* was most offensive to the Protestant minds of the Parishioners, and requested him to remove it. The reverend gentleman, however, would not do so. Mr. PALK, therefore, very quietly caused it to be removed.'—(*ib.* June 21, 1854.) The next proceeding was, that Mr. PALK was cited into the Consistory Court by the Incumbent for 'removing a *Credence-Table* from the Chancel of the Church. CHANCELLOR MARTIN said, there was no doubt Mr. PALK had exceeded his duty in removing the *Credence-Table*, as he ought to have applied for a "*Faculty*" for that purpose; but the Incumbent had also exceeded his duty in placing it in the Chancel without a "*Faculty*." Under these circumstances he recommended that Mr. PALK should admit his error, when he would not order him to restore the Table; and Mr. GALTON could try the question by applying for a "*Faculty*" to replace it.'—(*The Times*, July 10, 1854.) In the course of the argument Chancellor MARTIN cited these words from PRIDEAUX'S *Churchwardens' Guide*:—"The *Churchwardens* being appointed for the repairs of a Church, can have no power or authority to deface or demolish any thing in it; but if there are any superstitious Pictures, or Paintings, in windows or on walls, or elsewhere, which will give just cause of offence, or any thing else which may either be a

"hindrance to the due performance of Divine Offices, or an inconvenience to the Parishioners, &c., the licence of the Ordinary must first be had before they can be removed."—Fully quoted in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*. Augst. 1854. (See also *supra* p. 480.)

With the above decision we would have concluded this branch of our subject, had we not thought that it might be profitable to our Readers to annex the *additional Opinions* which have come across our reading since the preceding pages have been printed off; and, at the same time, to introduce the more recent 'cases' capable of illustrating the arguments we have advanced. In referring to these later occurrences, it has been thought proper, in certain instances, particularly where they have been charged with 'savouring of Popery,' to cite from *Gavantus*, and *Pugin*, the usages of the Roman Church, in order to assist the judgment of the Reader in determining *what is*, and *what is not*, of a Romanizing character.

### ADDITIONAL CASES, & OPINIONS.

ALMS-BASIN. [pp. 491—493, and *Note*, p. 601.]—

In a *Tract*, a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," we read—"The Alms may be collected in *Velvet-Bags*; they will be transferred into the *Alms-Dish* (which should not go out of the Chancel) by the Gospeller, and by him presented to the Celebrant." (p. 27.)—Pub. by "The Cambridge Camden Society."

At ST PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, a 'Presentment' was made to the Ordinary by the Parish Churchwarden (Dec. 20th 1853.) against the following, among other usages:—"The two Churchwardens approach the *Railing* in front of the Altar, one the 'north and the other the south side; here each finds *two golden Dishes*, with a piece of red cloth with embroidered border, and the 'monogram, **I.H.S.** inside them, placed for him: they turn round and come down to the foot of the steps leading to the Chancel, where the Clerk is waiting on the north, and the Verger on the south side, for their *Plate or Basin*; and, during the *intoning of the Sentences* previously alluded to, the Offertory money is collected, and each takes up his *Plate* to one of the Curates, who with the large *Alms-Dish* before him on the *Railing*, is waiting to receive and place them therein; when this is done, it is handed by him to the REV. MR. LIDDELL, who reverently places it on the "*Altar*" before the *Cross*.' (p. 11).—*Letter of Protest to the BP. OF LONDON* from C. Westerton, *One of the Churchwardens*.

## ALMS-CHEST. [pp. 493—494].—

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD says:—‘It is usual to place above such *Alms-box* upon an ornamental *scroll*, a suitable inscription ‘from Holy Scripture on the duty of Alms-giving.’ (p. 31.)—*Parochialia*.

The ‘*INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA*’ recommends that the *iron-work* be not japanned, as is usual on packing-cases, but merely oiled. Inside of the *Alms-Chest* is ‘an inclined *plate of iron*, which ‘runs the whole length of the Box, resting loosely upon fillets at ‘the two ends. Money dropped in at the lid rolls down this *plate*, ‘and is at once covered and protected by it.’—PLATE 4.

\*. As to the uses to which *Alms-Chests* are sometimes applied, see *Note*, infra. p. 788.

## BIER. [pp. 508—509].—

The ‘*INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA*,’ giving an example of a *Bier* with a *hearse* upon it, which is intended to be covered with a *Pall*, writes:—‘The *Bier* ‘ought to be universally adopted, as ‘being much more convenient and decorous than the usual way ‘of carrying Coffins. The use of *Tressels* is thus dispensed with. ‘The *Bier* ought to stand towards the *west* end of every Church.’—PLATE 32.

## BOOKS—Bible, Prayer-Book, &amp;c. [pp. 510—515].—

In 1547. The *Injunctions* of Edward VI directed—‘That the ‘said Parsons, Vicars, and other Curates . . . shall provide within ‘three months next after this Visitation, one Book of the whole ‘*BIBLE*, of the largest Volume in English. And within one ‘twelvemonths next after the said Visitation, the “*Paraphrasis*” ‘of *Erasmus* also in English upon the Gospels. . . . The *Charges of* ‘which Books shall be ratably borne between the Parson and Ap- ‘proprietary, and Parishioners aforesaid, that is to say, the one ‘half by the Parson or Proprietary, and the other half by the Par- ‘ishioners.’—CARDWELL’S *Doc. Ann.* i. 8; GIBS, *Cod.* 202.

The *Canons* of 1571 enjoined:—‘*Æditiui* curabunt etiam ut ‘sacra *Biblia* sint in singulis Ecclesiis in amplissimo volumine ‘(si commodè fieri possit) quolia nunc Londini excusa sunt, ‘ut liber publicarum precum, ut sacræ *Homiliæ*, utque *Homiliæ*, ‘quæ nuper scriptæ sunt contra rebellionem, sint in singulis ‘Ecclesiis. *Ilos libros quam maxime integros et mandos esse con- ‘venit: laecratos autem aut sordidos nullo modo, ne populo fas- ‘tidium, et contemptum pariant.*’ (p. 234.)—SPARROW’S *Collection*.

The ‘*INSTRUMENTA ECCLESIASTICA*,’ speaking of the decorations of the *Service Book*, observes:—‘The Ornaments should be ‘*brass* or *silver*, the cover of the Book being of well-seasoned *Oak* ‘overlaid with leather, or rich velvet.’—PLATE 53.

## COMMUNION-TABLE. [pp. 527—540].—

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD remarks:—‘An *Oak Slab* covered with ‘velvet, or some other rich material, seems to be the *Communion-*

'Table most in accordance with the usages of the English Church. The dimensions of that figured are:—length 6 ft. 1 in; width, 2 ft. 6 in; height, 2 ft. 6 in. The shape of the covering should be oblong, not made to fit the form of the slab, but to hang in folds.' (p. 30).—*Parochialia*.

The *Tract*, a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," writes:—  
 'There is some difficulty in speaking on the subject of the *Altar*, on account of the vehement objections made by many to the use of any thing beyond a Table,—nay, to the very term *Altar*. We are not called on now to shew the needlessness of the first, and the absurdity of the second objection. We recommend, either (1) a solid mass of masonry, about 6 ft. by 4 ft. in size, and 3 ft. 6 in. in height; or (2) a slab of dark marble, the same size as before, supported at the same height on brackets, and about 6 in. in thickness; or (3) a slab as before, supported on shafts.... However well intentioned be the rich modern panellings of some stone *Altars*, they are not much in accordance with ancient models and therefore can scarcely be deemed correct.' (p. 14).—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.'* [The Editor quotes this passage merely for information, not for adoption, as stone *Altars* have been declared illegal by competent authority. See page 539.]

At ST. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, a 'Presentment' was made to the Ordinary by the Parish Churchwarden (Dec. 20th. 1853.), against the use of an '*Altar*,' in these words:—'No Table is provided, but instead of it, an elaborately carved *oaken Altar*, precisely like those used in Roman Catholic Cathedrals and Chapels.... This *Altar* has been placed on a *dais* or platform covered with carpet, and on it has been erected what they term a '*Super-Altar*, to give a greater elevation to the *Cross*, and huge *Candlesticks* with equally huge *Candles*, which stand upon it.' (p. 9).—*Letter of Protest to the BP. OF LONDON from C. Westerton, One of the Churchwardens.*

In a '*Remonstrance*' to the Incumbent, the same Churchwarden writes, (Feb. 4th. 1854,) when referring to the RUBRIC on this subject:—'There is not at the present time, nor hath there ever been, in the said Church of St Paul, any such Table provided as is directed by the said Rubric; but in the place thereof in the said Church, is retained and set up the ancient *Altar*, known before the Reformation as the "*High-Altar*"... I have good reason to complain of the setting up of the said "*High-Altar*," as being foreign and utterly unauthorized by any Law, Canon, custom, or authority, known or existing since the time of the Reformation; and I protest solemnly and earnestly against the said innovation.' &c. (p. 8).—*Letter of Remonstrance to the HON. AND REV. R. LIDDELL.*

The BP. OF LONDON replied to the 'Presentment,' of the Churchwarden (March 28th. 1854,) thus:—'With respect to the *Communion-Table*, which the 'Memorial' designates the "*High-Altar*,' I have to observe that you use that term incorrectly. The "*High-Altar*" is the principal Altar in a Church where there are more than one, which is not the case in any of our Churches, except in a few instances, where a Church is divided into two parts, and Divine Service is performed in each. The *Communion-Table* in St Paul's Church cannot be termed an "*Altar*," except

‘in a figurative sense of the word. It is not of *stone*, but *wood*; not *fixed*, but *moveable*. When I consecrated the Church, the disputes on this article of Church furniture had not risen to such a pitch as they have since attained; and the *height* of the *Communion-Table* did not attract my notice. It is now a part of the goods of the Parish; and, although the Churchwardens, with my consent, and that of the Vestry, might change it, or replace it by another, I do not believe that I have authority not acting as a judge in my Court, to direct them so to do. If any persons think it to be the duty of the Churchwardens to make such a change, they must proceed against them by a suit in the Consistorial Court.’ (p. 43)—*Correspondence between the BP. OF LONDON and the Churchwarden*. Pub. by C. Westerton.

GAVANTUS cites the *Rubric* of the Roman *Missal*, describing the preparation of the *Altar* for the celebration of the Mass; the knowledge of which may be useful in these times:—  
 ‘ALTARE in quo sacrosanctum Missæ sacrificium celebrandum est, debet esse lapideum, et ab Episcopo consecratum: vel saltem *Ara lapidea*, similiter ab Episcopo consecrata, in eo inserta, quæ tam ampla sit, ut Hostiam, et majorem partem Calicis capiat. Hoc Altare operiatur tribus *Mappis*, seu *tobaleis mundis*, ab Episcopo, vel alio habente potestatem benedictis, *superiori* saltem oblonga, quæ usque ad terram pertingat, duabus aliis brevioribus, vel una duplicata. *Pallio* quoque ornatur *coloris*, quoad fieri potest, Diei festo, vel officio convenientis. Super ALTARE collocetur *Crux* in medio,\* et *Candelabra* saltem duo\* cum *Candelis acensis* hinc et inde in utroque ejus latere. Ad Crucis pedem ponatur *Tabella* secretarum appellata. In cornu Epistolæ *Cussinus* supponendus Missali: et ab eadem parte Epistolæ paretur *Cereus*, ad elevationem Sacramenti accendendus, parva *Campanula* (tintinnabulum, clocha), *Ampullæ vitriæ* vini et aquæ cum *Pelvicula*, et *Manutergio mundo*, in *Fenestalla*, seu in parva *Mensa* ad hæc præparata, Super ALTARE nihil omnino ponatur, quod ad Missæ sacrificium, vel ipsius ALTARIS ornatum non pertineat.—*Thesaurus*. Vol. i. p. 65. Lugduni Ed. 4to. A. D. 1664.

Mr. A. W. PUGIN, the Romanist, says:—‘In primitive times, there was but one *Altar* in each Church, and this was placed immediately in front of the Apsis, where the Bishop and Clergy sat in a semicircle.... These *Altars* were often constructed of wood, overlaid with precious metals. *Stone Altars* were occasionally used at a very early period, but they were not enjoined till the 6th century, and these were generally open, consisting of slabs

\* GAVANTUS in his comments, adds:—‘*Crux* in Altari collocanda imaginem Crucifixi habeat, et præalta emineat *Candelabris*.’—(ib. p. 291.). And with respect to *Candles*:—‘In Festis solemnioribus *plura Candelabra* debent apponi, non tamen ultra sex, in linea recta etiam in Missa solemniori, non Pontificali: quæ neque omnino æqualia erunt, sed ab utroque *Altaris* latere surgent, ita ut ex eis altiora sint immediate prope *Crucem*. In Festis autem minus solemnibus pauciora, saltem quatuor apponenda forent.’—(ib. p. 73.)

‘supported by pillars, beneath which the relics of the Saints were deposited in small shrines. To protect them from dust, or irreverence, Curtains were suspended, hung on small rods, inside the Altar; and these, subsequently, suggested the idea of ornamenting the Altar fronts with embroidered hangings, which were called the *Antependium* or *Frontal*.... The ancient Altars were all detached, without any *Screen* or *Reredosa* behind them. But after the 13th century they were invariably fixed against a wall, or stone screen. In this country *Altars* may now be constructed with equal propriety in the following different manners:— (1) *Of four stone walls*, supporting a stone slab, with a frontal of embroidery, chased metal, or mosaic work.... (2) *Four or six low pillars of stone, marble, or metal*, standing on a raised base, supporting the slab. (3) *Stone corbels*, projecting from the wall, with angels or other imagery, on which the Altar stone rests. This method is only available for small Altars. (4) *Stone walls* with the front divided into compartments, with niches and images somewhat after the fashion of a high tomb.... There should be a contrivance for the occasional suspension of an *Antependium*. In all cases the slab must be of *one stone*, without fracture or blemish. The *Wall behind the Altar* may be enriched by niches filled with sacred images, or garnished by a low *Reredos*, called a *Super-Altare*, made of oak, gilt and panelled, or of precious metals, enamelled and jewelled. Sometimes the wall was simply hung with *needlework*, varied with the festivals; or decorated by a *Triptych*, with folding leaves, painted on both sides, to be opened during the time of offering the Holy Sacrifice. *Curtains* should be hung on either side of the Altar, about 18 in. from the ends: these may be supported either by irons fixed into the wall, or rods running from the wall to upright shafts on each side of the Altar, supporting images of angels with lights.’ (p. 9.)....

ALTAR-STEPS.—‘The present custom of the Church requires the Altar to be elevated by *three grees* (from *gradus*) or steps at least, not less than one foot wide, nor more than 8 in. high; and these are reckoned from the upper plain of the Choir. It does not appear, however, that the ancient Altars were so much elevated. ... In the old Roman *Ordo* only *two* steps are mentioned, *Gradus superior* or *altior*, and *inferior*. But if we descend to later times, we shall find some of the Altars were raised on several steps, and nothing can add more to the majesty of the place of Sacrifice, than a considerable elevation above the pavement of the Church.’ (p. 138.).—ALTAR-STONES:—‘With a very few exceptions, the *Altar-Stones* were removed in the reign of EDWARD VI, and either broken, or used unbroken, as pavement.... Every *Altar-Stone* should have 5 *Crosses* incised in it, one in the centre, and at each corner. A small cavity to hold relics is now worked in the Stone, but this does not appear to have been the case with the ancient *Altar-Stones*. The size of *Altar-Stones* varies considerably; 10 ft. long, and 3 ft. wide, is about the size and proportion for a *High-Altar*; and 6 ft. long, by 2 ft. 6 in. wide for a *Side-Altar*.’ (p. 197.)—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume*.

#### COMMUNION-BREAD. [pp. 549 – 563.]—

Mr. A. W. PUGIN writes:—‘According to the Latin rite *Altar-breads* should be unleavened, and of a circular form. They are



'baked between two irons, and receive an impression of a sacred image or emblem....The *Altar-breads* for the *Mass* are now made considerably larger than those for the Communion of the faithful. Formerly they were all large, and broken in parts for the Communion; a particle only being carried to the Sick. The small *Altar-breads* appear to have been introduced in the middle of the 11th century. In the FIRST PRAYER-BOOK of EDW. VI. it is ordered that the *Communion-bread* be made round and unleavened, but somewhat thicker, and thereon no prints. The use of *Wafer-bread* for the Communion was kept up in the Anglican Church till the great Rebellion. In the SCOTCH SERVICE BOOK 'round unleavened Wafers are ordered for the Communion.' (p. 28.)—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume.*

### COMMUNION BREAD AND WINE—*Placing* [pp. 570—574.]—

At ST. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, in the 'Presentment' made to the Ordinary by the Parish Churchwarden, (Dec. 20th. 1853), the following complaint occurs:—'The REV. MR. LIDDELL, and two other Curates, with, occasionally, volunteer Clergymen, walk in procession from the Vestry; each bearing one or more of the *Vessels* to be used at the Communion. As they approach the *Altar*, on which stands a large *Cross*, MR. LIDDELL bows to it reverently, and places on the *Credence-Table* by its side, the *Vessel* he has brought. MR. NUGEE also bowing reverently, now approaches, and giving up what he has brought to be placed there, takes his place on the south side of it, followed by the others, who having followed his example, take their places behind him.' (p. 5.)—*Letter of Protest to the Bp. of London from C. Westerton, One of the Churchwardens.*

In the '*Remonstrance*' to the Incumbent by the same Churchwarden, (Feb. 4th. 1854,) this procession of the Officiating Clergymen is more fully detailed: thus—'Each bearing, with much pomp and ceremony, one or more of the *Vessels* used in the Offices of the Church. This procession of the Clergy proceeds in pompous ceremonial order from the Vestry.... As you, the said Incumbent, approach this place, (the *Altar*), you look towards the said *Cross*, and bow to it with theatrical gesture, and then with other histrionic displays, incurvations, and bowings, place upon the '*Credentia*,' or diminutive preparatory *Altar*, the *Vessel* which you have borne in procession. Immediately after the performance of this portion of this strange ceremonial, a Curate advances towards the same spot with similar gestures, bowings, and genuflections. The Curate then deposits the piece of furniture or utensil which he has brought into your hands, and you, in repeating the said ceremonial action, proceed to place this *Vessel* beside that already deposited upon the said '*Credentia*,' or diminutive preparatory *Altar*. The Curate then takes his place on the south side of the *High-Altar*, followed by the others in procession, bowing and gesticulating with much solemn vehemence, and this remnant of the procession proceeds to take their respective places in some symmetrical order.' (p. 5.)—*Letter of Remonstrance to the Hon. and Rev. R. LIDDELL.*

The Rev. R. LIDDELL replied to this Protest of the Churchwarden in a Letter to the BISHOP OF LONDON, (Feb. 27th. 1854), and

stated with respect to this question:—"The vehement gesticulations," "histrionic displays," "theatrical gestures," "incurvations," and "genuflexions" before the commencement of Divine Service, resolve themselves into our kneeling down on our respective hassocks, and saying a short private prayer, according to universal custom....As regards the *placing of the Elements*, he adds:—"I lower my head as I pass within the Rails to the *Credence*, but I neither bow to the *Cross*, nor make any formal obeisance or genuflexion to the Altar—either then or at any other time. It involves no principle, and is therefore to me a matter of indifference, whether the Elements are placed on the *Credence-Table* before the commencement of Divine Service, or immediately before the *Holy Communion* itself.—If your Lordship has any distinct wish upon the subject, I am ready to comply with it. (p. 5.)....The only fault he (*Mr. Westerton*) finds with my mode of celebrating Holy Communion is, that I remove the Elements from the *Credence* to the *Communion-Table*, at the precise time prescribed by the *Rubric*, "with much show and pompous gesticulation." The fact I admit; the show of gesticulation I deny." (p. 15).—*Letter to the BP. OF LONDON*. Published by J. T. Hayes.

The BP. OF LONDON, in reply to the 'Presentment' of the Churchwarden, (*March 28th. 1854.*) observed:—"With respect to a procession of the Clergy, bearing the Vessels and Elements used at the Holy Communion. This I regard as a distinct imitation of the practice of the Romish Church, and MR. LIDDELL has assented to my request for its discontinuance. If the Vessels, or Elements, are brought into the Church before the Celebration of the Holy Communion begins, they should be brought without any procession or ceremonial, before the commencement of Divine Service."\* (p. 40).—*Correspondence between the BP. OF LONDON, and the Churchwarden*. Pub. by C. Westerton.

GAVANTUS quotes the following Rubric of the Roman Missal bearing on this subject, which will in some degree explain the kind of procession adopted in the Romish Church, the imitating of which has been charged against certain Clergymen of the Church of England.—*Sacerdos omnibus paramentis iodutus, accipit manu sinistra Calicem ut supra præparatum, quem portat elevatum*

---

\* In the '*Guardian*' of May 3rd, 1854, the following paragraph appears on this subject:—"We are told that in a country Parish in the diocese of Canterbury, it is the custom on those Sundays on which the *Holy Communion* is celebrated, for the Vicar to proceed from the Vestry carrying the *Paten* and *Chalice*, followed by his Curate bearing the *Flagon*. Beyond this decent ceremony there is nothing in the Service to offend even the Churchwarden of St. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*; but, our Correspondent adds, "what a gross scandal upon them would the poor and simple Parishioners consider it, and how might it considerably disturb their unanimity, if they were told that they had been for a length of time conniving at a *Romish practice*, for so the BISHOP OF LONDON directly characterizes such a procession, independent of that formed by the Choristers, &c., in entering the Church."

‘ante pectus, *Bursam* manu dextra super Calice tenens, et *facta*  
‘*reverentia Cruci*, vel *imagini illi*, quæ in Sacristia erit, capite  
‘co-operto (*ne amota manu dextra cadat aliquid de Calice*) accedit  
‘ad ALTARE, *Ministro* cum Missali et aliis ad celebrandum  
‘necessariis (nisi ante fuerint præparata) præcedente Superpelli-  
‘ceum induto. Procedit autem *oculis demissis, incessu gravi*,  
‘*erecto corpore*. Si vero contigerit eum transire ante ALTARE  
‘majus, capite co-operto, *faciat ad illud reverentiam*: si ante  
‘locum Sacramenti, *genuflectat*: si ante ALTARE, ubi celebretur  
‘Missa, in qua elevatur vel tunc ministratur Sacramentum, similiter  
‘*genuflectat*, et detecto capite *illud adoret*, nec ante surgat,  
‘quam Celebrans deposuerit *Calicem* super Corporale.’—*Theaurus*.  
Vol. i. p. 92. Lugduni. Ed. 4to. A. D. 1664.

### COMMUNION CLOTHS. &c. [pp. 576—591.]—

The Tract, “A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS,” states:  
—“*Needlework*, and *Embroidery*, are wanted for the *Altar-Cloth*,  
‘the *Corporas* or *Napkin* to be laid over the Elements, the  
‘*Antependium* of the Litany-Desk, and *Frontal* for the Pulpit.  
‘We may be allowed to ask, would not the time, money, and  
‘ingenuity, spent in worsted-work, satin-stitch, bead-work, and  
‘the like frivolities, be better employed in preparing an offering  
‘for God in the adornment of His Holy Dwelling Places? How  
‘after hour is cheerfully sacrificed in working for those *Charity*  
‘*Bazaars* which cheat the honest workwoman, and would fain  
‘teach us that we *can* serve God and Mammon; no time is then  
‘thought too much, no expense too great, no labour too wearisome.  
‘But when an *Altar-frontal*, or *carpet* is to be wrought, there the  
‘commonest materials and commonest work are thought good enough.  
‘Better examples were set in former times, as here and there a tattered  
‘piece of Church embroidery remains to assure us. .... In former times  
‘more than one *Altar-Cloth* was provided, according to the differ-  
‘ent Feasts on which they might be used. Thus, that employed  
‘on an ordinary Sunday was *green*; that on the great Feasts, as  
‘Easter and Pentecost, richly wrought *with gold*, the symbol  
‘of triumph; that on the festival of any Martyr *scarlet*, in refer-  
‘ence to his resisting unto blood; that used on the Purification  
‘and Annunciation, *white*, the colour of purity. During Lent,  
‘a *purple* Altar-Cloth was employed, excepting only on Easter-Eve,  
‘when the Altar was entirely stripped. Any of the *symbols*  
‘mentioned might here be worked with gold thread on the velvet.”  
(p. 26.)...At the time of Celebration, it proceeds to say:—“The “*fair*  
‘*Linen Cloth*” will only hang down over the sides, not in front of the  
‘Altar: there will be a strip of carpet up the middle of the Chancel,  
‘just in front of the *Altar*, and in front of the *Sedilia*.” (p. 27.)—  
*Pub. by the ‘Cambridge Camden Society.’* (See also GAVANTI *The-*  
*saurus* quoted *infra*. p. 778.)

At ST. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge* a ‘Presentment’ was made  
to the Ordinary by the Parish Churchwarden, (Dec. 20th. 1853),  
against the *Altar*, being ‘covered with rich velvet “*Antependia*,”  
‘or *Altar-Cloths*, of colours varying with the seasons, embroidered  
‘with monograms, fleurs-de-lis, and other devices, in silver  
‘and gold....At certain seasons *Veils*, of rich embroidered lace’

[are about the Altar.] (p. 9). . . . After the consecration of the Wine, the 'Presentment' proceeds to complain of MR. LIDDELL covering the Cups 'with a lace veil.' (p. 14)—*Letter of Protest to the BP. OF LONDON from C. Westerton. One of the Churchwardens.*

In a '*Remonstrance*' to the Incumbent, (Feb. 4th. 1854), the same Churchwarden proceeds:—'I have further to complain of 'the continual use of divers *Vessels, Utensils, Scarfs, or Maniples*, ' (such as are used by the Priests of the Roman Catholic Church), '*Veils, Corporals*, and other things unknown to the Services of 'the Protestant Reformed Church. . . . And I also complain of 'the *Veils of embroidered lace*, of the *bouquets of flowers*, and 'other foreign frippery, which are constantly to be seen upon, 'or attached to the said "*High Altar*," and in other parts of the 'said Church.' (p. 10).—*Letter of Remonstrance to the HON. AND REV. R. LIDDELL.*

The REV. R. LIDDELL, replying to this passage of the Protest in his letter to the BP. OF LONDON (Feb. 27. 1854), stated, that he simply used the *Church Linen* which he found established at St Paul's, adding:—'Against which I have never, until now, 'heard any exception made. Many free-will offerings of this 'kind have been made to the Church, and these articles are of a 'more delicate texture than what is ordinarily used; but consider- 'ing the wealth of our Congregation, and that we are encouraged 'in Scripture to offer unto the Lord of our best, I can see no objec- 'tion in this. Rather should I say that the spirit evinced by these 'gifts is most praiseworthy; and in my humble opinion, there is 'nothing in the gifts themselves that outsteps the limits of our 'Church's law, or is inconsistent with the purest taste. I need 'scarcely add, that it is all open to your Lordship's inspection.' (p. 9).—*Letter to the BP. OF LONDON. Pub. by J. T. Hayes.*

The BP. OF LONDON, in his decision upon the several points of the 'Presentment' of the Churchwarden, (Mar. 28, 1854), said on this subject:—'*I disapprove of the custom of using worked and embroi- 'dered linen for the cover of the Communion-Table and Elements*, 'instead of fine, but plain damask linen; but the use of it is not 'contrary to any Rubric or Canon.' (p. 44).—*Correspondence be- 'tween the BP. OF LONDON and the Churchwarden. Pub. by C. West- erton.*

GAVANTUS quotes this Rubric of the Roman Missal respect- ing COLOURS:—'*Paramenta Altaris, Celebrantis, et Ministrorum*, 'debeant esse coloris convenientis officio, et Missæ diei, secundum 'usum Romanæ Ecclesiæ, quæ quinque Coloribus uti convenit, '*Albo, Rubeo, Viridi, Violaceo, et Nigro.*' (Vol. I. p. 53.) He adds, 'Totidem enumerat colores INNOCENTIUS III. (i. c. 65.), 'quamvis *nigrum* confundere videatur cum *violaceo*, quatuor prin- 'cipales faciens colores, quatuor coloribus antiquarum Vestium 'legalium respondentes; Byssi, Purpuræ, Hyacinthi, et Cocci; '*(Eccl. 28).*'—He then cites as follows:—

I. "ALBO colore utitur a vespere vigiliæ, Nativitatis Domini "usque ad octavam Epiphaniæ inclusive, exceptis festis Marty- "rum, quæ infra eam veniunt. Feria V. in Cœna Domini, et "Sabbato sancto in officio Missæ, et ab illo die usque ad Sah- "batum in vigilia Pentecostes ad nonam, in Officio de Tempore, "præterquam in Missa Litaniarum, et Rogationum. In festo "Sanctissimæ Trinitatis. In festo Corporis Christi, In festo "Transfigurationis Domini. In festis beatæ Mariæ Virginis,

“præterquam in benedictione Candelarum, et processione, quæ fit  
 “in festo Purificationis ejusdem. In festis Angelorum. In Nativ-  
 “itate S. Joannis Baptistæ. In principali festo S. Joannis Evange-  
 “listæ, quod celebratur infra octavam Nativitatis Domini. In  
 “utraque Cathedra S. Petri. In festo S. Petri ad vincula. In  
 “Conversione S. Pauli. In festo Omnium Sanctorum. In festis  
 “Confessorum Pontificum, et non Pontificum, et Doctorum. In  
 “festis sanctarum Virginum non Martyrum, et nec Virginum, nec  
 “Martyrum. In Dedicatione, et Consecratione Ecclesiæ, vel Altaris,  
 “ac in consecratione summi Pontificis, et in anniversario creationis,  
 “et coronationis ejusdem, et electionis et consecrationis Episcopi.  
 “Item per octavas prædictorum festorum, quæ octavas habent,  
 “quando dicitur Missa de octava, et in Dominicis infra eas occur-  
 “rentibus, quando in eis fit officium de Dominica, præterquam in  
 “illis Dominicis, quibus tributus est color *Violaceus*. In Missis  
 “Votivis supradictorum festorum, quocumque tempore dicantur:  
 “in Missa de Sponso, et Sponsa.” (p. 53.)

II. “*RUBEO colore* utitur Vigilia Pentecostes in Missa usque  
 “ad Sabbatum sequens finita Nona et Missa in festis sanctæ  
 “Crucis. In decollatione S. Joannis Baptistæ. In Natali Apos-  
 “tolorum Petri et Pauli, et in festis aliorum Apostolorum (exceptis  
 “festis principali S. Joannis Evangelistæ post Nativitatem,  
 “et festis Conversionis S. Pauli, et Cathedræ S. Petri, et ejus Vin-  
 “culorum). In festo S. Joannis ante Portam Latinam. In com-  
 “memoratione S. Pauli Apostoli. In festis Martyrum, excepto  
 “festis Sanctorum Innocentium, quando non venerit in Dominica:  
 “si autem in Dominica venerit, utitur *Rubeo*; in ejus vero die  
 “octava semper utitur *Rubeo*, quocumque die occurrat. In festis  
 “sanctarum Virginum martyrum, et Martyrum non Virginum. Item  
 “per Octavas prædictorum festorum quæ Octavas habent, quando fit  
 “de octava, et in Dominicis infra eas Octavas occurrentibus, eodem  
 “modo ut dictum est supra de *colore albo*. Item in Missis votivis  
 “supradictorum festorum, et in Missa pro eligendo summo Ponti-  
 “fice.”—GAVANTUS observat:—“*Rubeus* color, seu *purpureus*,  
 “indicat dignitatis gradum aliis excellentiorem: humano sanguini  
 “similis est, igneam refert naturam: ex quibus facile patebunt  
 “sequentes ritus.” (p. 56.)

III. “*VIRIDI colore* utitur ab octava Epiphaniæ usque ad  
 “Septuagesimam, et ab octava Pentecostes usque ad Adventum  
 “exclusive, in Officio de Tempore, excepta Dominica Trinitatis,  
 “ut supra: ac exceptis Dominicis infra Octavas occurrentibus, in  
 “quibus color octavarum servatur: exceptis etiam Vigiliis, quatuor  
 “Temporibus, ut infra.”—GAVANTUS addit:—“Eadem in citato  
 “Directorio. Viridis color medius est inter colores, ait INNOC. III.  
 “et ideo utimur eo in diebus ferialibus, et communibus, inquit  
 “ille: cujusmodi sunt dies ab octava Epiphaniæ usque ad Sep-  
 “tuagesimam, et ab octava Pentecostes usque ad Adventum,  
 “in Officio de Tempore. Dies etiam Dominici minus solemnes  
 “sunt his temporibus, et communes vocantur ab INNOCENTIO com-  
 “parative ad alias Dominicas et solemnitates anni.” (p. 56.)

IV. “*VIOLACEO colore* utitur a prima Dominica Adventus in  
 “primis Vesperis, usque ad Missam Vigiliæ Nativitatis Domini  
 “inclusive: et a Septuagesima usque ad Sabbatum sanctum ante  
 “Missam inclusive, in Officio de Tempore: excepta feria quinta in  
 “Cœna Domini in qua utitur *Albo*, et feria sexta in Parasceue, in qua  
 “utitur *Nigro*, ut infra: et benedictione Cerei in Sabbato sancto,  
 “in qua DIACONUS, illius Præfationem dicens, solus utitur *Albo*:

"ea autem finita, *Violaceo* ut prius. Item in Vigilia Pentecostes "ante Missam, a prima Prophetia usque ad benedictionem Fontis "inclusive. In quatuor Temporibus, et Vigiliis quæ jejuntur, "exceptis Vigilia et quatuor Temporibus Pentecostes. In Missa "Litaniarum in die S. Marci Evangelistæ, et Rogationum, et in "Processionibus quæ his diebus fiunt. In festo SS. Innocentum, "quando non venerit in Dominica. In benedictione Candelarum "in die Purificationis beatæ Mariæ, et in benedictione Cinerum, ac "Palmarum, et in ipsa Dominica in Palmis, et in eorundem, ac "generaliter in omnibus Processionibus: exceptis Processionibus "sanctissimi Sacramenti, et quæ fiunt in diebus solemnibus, vel pro "gratiarum actione. In Missis de Passione Domini, pro quacumque necessitate, pro peccatis, ad tollendum schisma, contra "paganos, tempore belli, pro pace, pro vitanda mortalitate, pro iter "agentibus, et pro infirmis."—GAVANTUS remarks:—"Eadem fere "habet *citatum Directorium*. Tempore INNOCENTII III. *Niger* "color adhibebatur iis diebus, quibus a nobis *Violaceus*; quo utebatur "Ecclesia tunc temporis bis tantum in anno, in Festo Innocentium, "et in Dominica Lætare, diebus, inquam, afflictionis, et abstinentiæ; "pro peccatis, et pro defunctis, inquit ille: nunc autem conveni- "entius *Violaceo* utimur ab Adventu ad Natalem Domini, et a Sep- "tuagesima usque ad Pascha." (p. 57.).

V. "NIGRO colore utitur feria sexta in Parasceue, in omnibus "Officiis, et Missis defunctorum."—GAVANTUS says:—"Mortis est "propriissimus color *Niger* apud omnes. (INNOC. loco citato. c. 65.). To this he adds:—

'Regula vero in mutandis coloribus ea est, ut mutatio fiat in "primis Vesperis festi. Si autem Vesperæ non sint integræ, is "color adhibendus est initio Vesperarum, qui congruit illi de quo "dicitur capitulum. Si Officium et Missa discordant, color *Altaris* "sequatur Officium; *Vestium* autem *sacerdotis* sit color *Missæ* con- "formis, quæ diversitas accidere solet in feria tertia Rogationum, "et in Vigiliis infra Octavas. Pro Missa vero solemnī convenit, ut "pallium etiam *Altaris* concordet cum colore Paramentorum *Missæ*, "quod annotavit recte P. RUIZ. in suo *Ceremoniali*." (p. 58.).

He also adds:—"Gradus Altarium vestiri poterunt *topetibus*, et "præsertim suppedaneum illud, quod proximum est Altari, super "omnes gradus." (p. 73.).—*Thesaurus* Vol. i. Lugduni Edit. 4to. See as to Colour "The ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER," *postea*.

Mr. A. W. PUGIN, speaking of the *Romish ALTAR-CLOTH*, says:—"The term may be indifferently applied to the Linen coverings of "the *Altar*, and to the embroidered bangings which were suspended "over the back, or in front of the same. Every *Altar* is now re- "quired to be covered with *three linen cloths*, in addition to the "cere or wax cloth; the two under ones need not exceed the length "of the Altar, but the uppermost should hang down at each end, "nearly to the pavement, being rather more than the width of the "Altar. It should likewise have 5 crosses worked on it, in the "centre and four angles, with borderings of various patterns. In "primitive times it appears that the Altars were covered with a "rich tissue or precious stuff, over which one linen Cloth was laid "during the time of celebrating. This served also for the *Corporal*, "and was called a *Pall*. Subsequently, the *Corporal* was a distinct "linen Cloth set apart especially for the purpose. The Cloths used "in covering the Altars were designated by the word *Palla*, down "to a late period. (p. 20)....After the end of the 9th century the

'Altars were always covered with a *linen Cloth* for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. The custom of covering the Altar with 3 cloths is not older than the 14th, or 15th century. (p. 26)...The *Altar-Cloths* which hang in front of the Altars may also have originated from the custom of placing the shrines of Saints beneath those Altars which were supported on pillars, and suspending *Curtains* on rods fixed under the slabs, to protect them from dust. These rods were concealed by a fringed bordering of stuff hung before them; and this narrow lappet is still found on many *Frontals*.' (p. 27.)

'The *CORPORAL* is a white Linen Cloth laid on the Altar, and on which the sacred Body and Blood of our Lord are consecrated. According to the present custom the *Corporals* are not more than about 18 in. square, but anciently they covered the whole top of the Altar....The expression of a "*Corporal oath*," originated in the ancient custom of swearing solemnly on the *Corporal Cloth*, containing the sacred Body of our Lord. DORANDUS says, "The *Corporal* is so folded that the ends do not appear: in which is contained a figure of Christ's Divinity, having neither beginning nor ending"...The *Corporal CASE* was a case of silk, velvet, or cloth of gold, frequently embroidered with sacred imagery, in which the *Corporal Cloth* was kept, and carried to the Altar.' (p. 80.) MR. PUGIN also designates this Cloth the *Corporas*. (p. 70.)

'The *DOSSELL* or *Dorsal* is a piece of embroidered needlework, or cloth of gold, suspended at the back of a *Throne* or *Altar*, but more particularly the latter. It is derived from the French *Dossier*, which signifies a back panel, covered with stuff. The *Dossells* used in the ancient Churches corresponded in colour with the other ornaments of the Altars, and were changed according to the Festivals. At *Funerals* it is customary on the Continent to suspend a *black Dossel* with a large *Cross* over the back of the Altar.' (p. 110.)

'*FRONTALS* were of three kinds. (1) Of precious metals, adorned with enamels, and jewels. (2) Of wood, painted, gilt, embossed, and often set with crystals. (3) Of cloth of gold, velvet, or silk, embroidered, and occasionally enriched with pearls.' (p. 30.)

'*CARPETS* of appropriate designs (floriated devices are more suitable than the Holy Name, or sacred representations) were laid before the Altars, and on the Choir and Sanctuary pavements on solemn occasions; they were termed, *Tapets*, *Coverlets*, or *Pede-cloaths*.' (p. 53.)

'*NEEDLEWORK*. All the finer ornaments of the Sacred Vestments were worked in *Needlework*, and that with surprising skill and feeling, the expression and character of the most minute countenances being perfectly rendered. In ancient accounts, work of this description is mentioned as *opus plumarium*.' (p. 166)

---

\* The *EVANGELISTIC SYMBOLS* occasionally to be met with, owe their origin,' says MR. PUGIN, 'to the *Vision of Ezekiel*, (where each of the four animals had four faces, being those of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle), and that of *St John* in the *Apocalypse* (where the four faces are on four distinct beasts). The four animals are appropriated as follows:—(1) *St. Matthew*, the *Angel*; (2) *St. Mark*, the *Lion*; (3) *St. Luke*, the *Calf*; (4) *St. John*, the *Eagle*.' (p. 118.)—*ib.*

'OFFERTORY: the *Veil* in which the Sub-deacon holds the 'PATEN....It was originally a linen cloth; and in the ritual of 'the Jacobins was called *Mappa*, but in that of the Cistercians, '*Offertorium*; by which name it was also distinguished by the 'English Church.' (p. 168).—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume*.

### COMMUNION-PLATE. &c. [pp. 594—601].—

The BISHOP OF EXETER (Dr. Phillpotts), remarking upon the display of the *Communion-Plate* when there is no Communion, says:—'The display of the *Sacramental Plate* on the Lord's Table, 'a display which is made almost in every Church where the *Plate* 'is worthy of being displayed, is a harmless, and in my opinion, 'a seemly usage, to decorate the Table of the Lord, and to testify 'men's wish to honour God's Service with the choicest of His substance.'—*Letter*, June 30th. 1843.

In the *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," we read:—'The *Holy Vessels* were anciently kept in an *Aumbrye* or '*Locker*; as they are to this day in St. Andrew's, Irnham, Lincolnshire. They should, if possible, be kept in the Church: and, 'of course, if an *Aumbrye* be used, due attention should be paid to 'its security. The usual position of *Aumbryes* was on the Gospel 'side of the Altar, though sometimes they are found in the east 'Wall. They are seldom much ornamented, though the door, 'where it remains, is sometimes elaborately carved.' (p. 15).—*Pub. by the Cambridge Camden Society*.

MR. A. W. PUGIN says:—CHALICE.—'There are four parts in 'a *Chalice*, the Foot, the Stem, the Knop, and the Bowl. The 'first may be of various shapes, but should extend considerably 'beyond the Bowl in diameter, to prevent the possibility of upsetting; on one division of the Foot there should be a *Cross* or '*Crucifix*, engraved or embossed, which is always turned towards 'the Priest while celebrating. The Stem unites the Foot to the 'Bowl, and on it is fixed the Knop, for the convenience of holding 'the *Chalice*; the Knop is variously enriched with enamels, jewels, 'or tracery and tabernacle work, while the Stem is frequently 'engraved or enamelled. The height of the Stem is generally about '4 in., and seldom exceeds 6 in. The Bowl varies from 3 to 6 in. 'in diameter, and of a proportionate depth; it should have a plain 'rim of about an inch below, that it may be enriched with engravings, inscriptions, and enamels. *Chalices* are usually made of 'silver, either whole or parcel gilt, occasionally of pure gold, and 'jewelled; formerly glass, crystal, or agate *Chalices* were sometimes used, but this is now prohibited on account of the brittle 'nature of the materials.' (p. 55.)

FLAGON.—'Crewetts (*Flagons*), small vessels of glass or metal, 'to contain the Wine and Water for consecration at the Altar. 'These have succeeded to much larger vessels....and to the still 'earlier *Amæ* and *Amulæ*....The body of the *Crewetts* should be 'made of crystal, glass, or some transparent substance to enable the 'Celebrant to distinguish readily between the Wine and Water.... 'VISCONTI (*de Missæ Apparatu*) writes, that the two *Crewetts*



'for the Wine and the Water of the Sacrifice are distinct from each other; the one called *Ama* or *Amula*, the Crewett for the Wine; and the other, *Seyphus*, the Crewett for the water: the material, silver or gold, and sometimes jewelled.' (p. 82.)

PATEN.—'One of the Vessels of the Altar, in which especially the *Altar-bread* is offered in the Holy Eucharist, before consecration, and in which also the *Host* is laid, immediately before the Communion of the Priest: and by which the Particles are gathered up from the *Corporal*, to be collected into the Chalice.... The *Paten* was formerly engraved, and sometimes enamelled, and set with jewels, inside as well as outside. The present discipline, however, does not allow engraving or other ornament, except on the outer side. The reason is, that the *Paten* is thus more easily purified. *Patens* were sometimes made of crystal, glass, and other substances in former times.' (p. 172.)—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume*.

### COMMUNION-RAILS. [pp. 602—603].—

GAVANTUS, in his comments on the *Rubrics* of the Roman Missal, says:—'*Sepimento ALTARIA munda conservantur, quo arcantur et laici, ne Altaribus inhæreant indecore.*'—*Thesaurus*. Vol. i. p. 73. Lugduni Ed. 4to. 1664.

In the *Tract* "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," the following remark occurs on this subject:—'*Altar-Rails* in a Church which has a Rood-Screen are not necessary. They gradually made their appearance after the Reformation, but were not general till ABP. LAUD's celebrated *Injunction* concerning them. The horrible profanities which occasioned that *Injunction* having ceased, there seems no reason why we should not return to the primitive arrangement, leaving the *Altar* rather to be defended by the reverence of the Worshipers, than by so ugly and inconvenient a fence. At the same time, where the *Rood-Screen* does not exist, there *Altar-Rails* must be used.' (p. 23.)—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.'*

At ST PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, the 'Presentment' of the Parish Churchwarden to the Ordinary, (Dec. 20th. 1853,) complains that 'the *Gate* of the *Railing* before the Altar is always open to display its decorations, it also enables those who wish to do so to bow down before the *Cross*.' (p. 14.)—*Letter of Protest to the BP. OF LONDON from C. Westerton. One of the Churchwds.*

DR. PRIDEAUX says:—'Before Churchwardens can legally place *Rails* at the Communion-Table, they must not only have the consent of the Parish, but also the leave of the Rector, to whom the Chancel belongs, and the Licence of the Ordinary.' (p. 50.)—*Churchwarden's Guide*.

### CREDENCE-TABLE. [pp. 604—609].—

The *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," when referring to the *Credence-Table*, writes:—'A good method of supplying this next to essential arrangement, is a large low *bracket*, on the north side. Such may still be seen in a few ancient

'Churches, though their original use is uncertain.... A *Credence* is implied by the RUBRIC which follows the Sentences in the Offertory: by this it is ordered that "the Priest shall then place upon the Table" &c. At least, if there be no *Table of Prothesis*, the Elements would require, till then, to be placed, as has sometimes been done, on the floor.' (p. 15).—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.'*

At ST. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, the use of the *Credence-Table* is inveighed against by the Parish Churchwarden in his '*Remonstrance*' to the Incumbent, (*Feb.* 4th 1854), wherein he says:—'I protest against the use of the said *Credence-Table*, as furniture or ornament utterly unknown to Ecclesiastical uses in the Protestant Reformed Church of England at any time since the Reformation; and I insist that the same is a mere Popish utensil; and I do accordingly protest against the use of the same, as a thing so utterly foreign and unknown in the Protestant Church, that it has no English word or exact equivalent to express its Roman name; an utensil, moreover, only mentioned in the Missals, or Roman Ceremonials declared unlawful by the statute, 3 & 4 *Edw. VI. c. 10.*' (p. 9).—*Letter of Remonstrance to the HON. AND REV. R. LIDDELL.*

THE REV. R. LIDDELL in his letter to the BP. OF LONDON, (*Feb.* 27th 1854,) replying to this '*Remonstrance*' of the Churchwarden, says, (after remarking that there were many things now existing in St. Paul's Church just as he found them):—'I may observe upon one point, viz: the *Credence-Table*, under the advice of a high legal authority—that SIR HERBERT JENNER FUST'S judgement in the case of the Templar Church at Cambridge related to a '*Faculty*' for placing a new *Credence-Table* in that Church—which was refused; but that this does not necessarily touch the case of removing a *Credence* that has, as in our case, been consecrated with the rest of the Church furniture, and has already for some time been in use.... I do not myself pretend to offer any opinion upon the point—but I shall continue to use the *Credence-Table*, until I am proved by competent authority to be legally wrong.' (p. 8).—*Pub. by J. T. Hayes.*

THE BP. OF LONDON, in answer to the Protest of the Churchwarden, decided, (*March* 28th, 1854,) on this point—'The *Credence-Table* was in the Church when consecrated; and I feel the same difficulty in directing its removal, or rather I should say, that I feel a somewhat greater difficulty; for I think that a '*CREDENCE-TABLE*,' or something equivalent to it, is in itself, an unobjectionable piece of Church Furniture. It seems to me more proper that the '*Elements*' should be somewhere at hand, so that the Officiating Clergyman may take them from it, and place them upon the '*Table*,' than that they should either be placed on the '*Table*,' before the commencement of Divine Service, (which is certainly contrary to the Rubric), or brought from the Vestry during its performance. At the same time, as a *Credence* is not mentioned in the Rubric or Canons, it may be removed by the process before mentioned, a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court. I myself prefer to a *Credence* a projecting shelf in the wall of the Chancel, or a recess, as is the case in some Churches, where the arrangement has excited no observation.' (p. 44).—*Correspondence between the BP OF LONDON, and the Churchwarden.* Pub. by C. Westerton. (See the '*case*' at p. 769.).

CROSS. [*pp.* 609—616.]—

The *Tract*, a "FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," says:—  
 'A *Plain Cross*, whether within or without a Church, is never  
 'to be allowed, since, as a general rule, all *Crosses*, whether on  
 'Monuments or gables, were floriated. The devices are almost  
 'endless, and always beautiful; and there can be no excuse for  
 'admitting original modern designs. The reason of the decorative  
 'form is this; the *Cross*, once the symbol of shame and suffering,  
 'has now become that of glory and felicity: its dry wood has  
 'blossomed and borne the fruit of our Salvation; and, therefore,  
 'fitly do we represent its arms as floriated, and itself as lovely.'  
 (*p.* 22).—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.'*

At ST PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, in the 'Presentment' of  
 the Parish Churchwarden to the Ordinary, (*Dec.* 20th 1853,) where  
 reference is made to the *Cross*, it is stated:—'This *Cross*  
 'stood on the *Altar* when your Lordship consecrated the Church,  
 'though concealed from general view by a large *Alms-Dish* placed  
 'there for that purpose: this *Cross*, My Lord, you ordered to  
 'be removed, but it has since been replaced.' (*p.* 9).—*Letter of*  
*Protest to the BP OF LONDON from C. Westerton. One of the Chw.*

In a '*Remonstrance*' to the Incumbent, (*Feb.* 4th, 1854), the  
 same Churchwarden says:—'I have next to complain, and I do  
 'accordingly protest against the setting up a *Cross* in any part of  
 'the said Church of St Paul; and I do more especially protest  
 'against the setting up a *Cross* upon the said '*High-Altar*' in the  
 'said Church, which I insist is without any authority whatsoever.  
 'I am the more induced to offer this, my humble, but sincere  
 'protest against the retention of this piece of foreign furniture in a  
 'Protestant Church, inasmuch as it is not only adapted to pollute  
 'the simple Services of our Public Worship with the superstitions  
 'of Rome, but further calculated, as the result has shewn in the  
 'Church of St Paul, to turn the simple and pure Service of the  
 'Reformed Protestant Church, into a theatrical exhibition, to  
 'the great scandal of Divine Worship, and to the prejudice and  
 ' manifold injury of the people.' (*p.* 9). *Letter of Remonstrance to*  
*the HON. AND REV. R. LIDDELL.*

THE REV. R. LIDDELL, in a Letter to the BP. OF LONDON,  
 (*Feb.* 27th, 1854,) in answer to this Protest of the Churchwarden,  
 remarks:—'The *Altar* and *Cross* were, I am informed, consecrated  
 'with the rest of the Church. But in gratitude to your Lordship,  
 'for your kind regard to the feelings of my Congregation, I am  
 'bound to mention, that when the removal of this *Cross* was  
 'contemplated in 1851, T. H. SOTHERON, Esq. M. P., one of the  
 'Churchwardens for that year, waited privately upon your Lord-  
 'ship, and stated that the religious instincts of the Congregation  
 'generally would, he had reason to believe, he painfully wounded  
 'by such a step. The opinion of so devout, yet sober-minded  
 'a Churchman as MR. SOTHERON, who for many years had  
 'been a member of the Congregation of S. Paul's, had doubtless  
 'its due weight with your Lordship. Your answer to him was,  
 'I believe, that you would give the matter further consideration;  
 'and there the question has rested.' (*p.* 9).—*Pub. by J. T. Hayes.*

The BP. OF LONDON, in his decision upon the 'Presentment' made by the Churchwarden, (*March 28th, 1854*), thus observed:—  
 'The wooden CROSS which is fixed upon the COMMUNION-TABLE, I consider to be objectionable; but when, soon after Mr LIDDELL'S appointment to St Paul's, I expressed a strong wish for its removal, I was assured by MR. SOTHERON, then one of the Churchwardens, that such removal would wound the feelings of a great number of the Congregation, and I therefore allowed the matter to remain in suspense. As this Cross (which is not large and massive, as you describe it, but small and slight), was on the Table when the Church was consecrated, (though not seen by me, a large Offertory-Dish being in front of it), I am not satisfied that I have authority to direct its removal without consent of the Churchwardens and Parishioners, except by a formal decree of the Consistorial Court: I certainly wish it to be removed, and should be glad if the Parishioners would agree to its removal without such authoritative sanction.' (*p. 43*).—*Correspondence between the BP OF LONDON and the Churchwarden*. Pub. by C. Westerton.

GAVANTUS quotes authorities explaining the Roman usage of the Cross on the Altar, thus:—*Innoc. III.* (l. 2. c. 21), qui dicit 'collocari Crucem in medio Candelabrorum, quæ saltem, sunt duo, quia Christus per Crucem fecit utraque unum'... Why there should be two Candelabra:—'Quibus significantur populi, præsertim Judæus et Gentilis'.... And why lighted:—'Puto, ad litteram, quia in cryptis fiebat Missa,' &c.... The *Ordo Rom.* says:—'In typum illius luminis, cujus Sacramenta conficimus, sine quo et in meridie palpabimus ut in nocte, (*Microl. c. 11*). Lumen hoc significat etiam fidem populorum, quos, ut diximus, denotant Candelabra, (*Innoc. III.*): vel charitatem Christi in sacrificio. (*ex August. Serm. 225, de Temp.*): vel quia Christus ut ignis rubiginem peccatorum consumit, (*Biel. Lect. 13*): vel quia expectamus spousum cum lumine (*ex Hier. Ep. 20*): vel ad devotionem excitandam, (*Soto. 4. d. 13. q. 2. art. 4*): vel ad lætitiā, quam Sacramentum indicat, æternam, (*Gemm. i. c. 118*).—*Theauras*, Vol. 1 pp, 68. 69. Lugduni Ed. 1664. (See *supra*. p. 773.).

MR. A. W. PUGIN describes nine different kinds of Crosses, distinguished according to their application. We are here only concerned with the Altar-Cross, Roods on lofts, and Marking Crosses.—*ALTAR-CROSS*. Every Altar is now required to be furnished with a Cross, and the image of our Lord Crucified. *Super Altare collocetur Crux in Medio*. It does not appear however that this practice commenced before the 10th century. The Crosses were fixed on the top of the Ciboria (Canopies) which covered the Altars, and without the Image of our Lord. During the middle ages each Altar was furnished with a separate standing Cross, with a foot, and the later ones had Images of our Blessed Lady and John on the sides' (*p. 83*).... *ROODS* were those Crosses, which were fixed on lofts or beams, between the Nave and the Choir of large Churches, or the Nave and the Chancel of small ones. They are of great antiquity.... Every jubæ, or Rood-loft, was provided with a rich Cross in the early times, but without the Image of our Lord Crucified. We have, however, proof that the Image of our Lord was attached to Crosses so early as the 8th century.... These Roods are found in the Churches of both the

'Greeks and the Latins, and till within a comparatively late period 'not one Church would have been found in France, Germany, or 'Flanders, without one. The Images of our Blessed Lady and 'St John are invariably placed at the foot of the *Cross*, on carved 'pedestals and uprights to receive them, and the whole richly gilt 'and painted. I do not imagine, however, that these were found 'on the early *Roods*. . . . Every Church in England was furnished 'with a *Rood* previous to the reign of Edward VI, when they were 'pulled down and destroyed by Act of Parliament. . . . *Rood-lofts* 'are most ancient in Cathedral and Conventual Churches, but in 'Parochial ones I am not aware of any example older than the latter 'part of the 14th century, and even these seem to have been additions 'to the Fabrics in which they were placed. Regular *Rood Stair-cases*, 'in external turrets, on the sides of the Church, or on each side of 'the Chancel-arch, and forming an original part of the Church 'itself, are not older than the 15th century.' (p. 88.) . . . 'MARKING 'CROSSES are those *Crosses* marked on Altar linen, and Church 'furniture, to stamp them as being exclusively devoted to sacred 'purposes. Altar Cloths, and Corporals, have generally *five*, in 'reference to the wounds of our Blessed Lord. Palls for the Chalice, 'one of larger description. Towels for the use of Altars, Surplices, 'Albes, Amices, should all be marked by small Crosses, stitched in 'coloured silk. Larger Crosses should be worked or painted on 'Banners, Hangings, Cushions, Curtains, Veils, &c.' (p. 90).—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume.*

### EVERGREENS, FLOWERS. &c. [pp. 617—625.]—

In the *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," when speaking of the *Yew tree*, we read:—'A *Yew* should be planted 'south of the Church, that at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, 'its boughs may be used to ornament the interior.' (p. 29)—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.*

At St. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, a 'Presentment' was made to the Ordinary by the Parish Churchwarden, (Dec. 20th, 1853), against certain usages, among which *Floral Decorations* were objected to; thus—'At certain seasons Veils of rich embroidered 'lace, and *bouquets of Flowers*, the choicest that can be procured, 'are crowded in profusion on and about it (the *Altar*): every 'niche of the Reredos on each side and above, is occupied with 'plants of the '*Camellia Japonica*,' and '*Fleurs Immortelles*,' and '*Evergreens* deck the main body of the Church itself. Vain and 'sad sight, indeed, My Lord, when we reflect that these expensive '*floral displays* have been hitherto paid for out of the Offertory 'money.' (p. 9).—*Letter of Protest to the Bp. of LONDON from C. Westerton. One of the Churchwardens.* . . . In a POSTSCRIPT (at p. 19.), dated March 31st, 1854., is added:—' *Bouquets* 'of *Flowers* on the *Altar* have been discontinued, their representative at Christmas last being a wreath of *white flowers* 'intertwoven with *green leaves*, suspended on the Cross on the '*Altar*. But the removal of the *bouquets* was counterbalanced 'by the appearance of a large *strip of white satin*, extending 'the whole width of the east window, on which was worked in 'medieval characters, "UNTO US A CHILD IS BORN."

THE REV. R. LIDDELL, in replying to the '*Letter of Remonstrance*' addressed to him, (*Feb.* 4th, 1854) by the same Churchwarden, writes to the BISHOP OF LONDON (*Feb.* 27th, 1854,) in answer:—"No bouquets of *Flowers* have ever been placed upon the Altar since I became Incumbent of S. Paul's. Had I any personal feeling about *decking the Lord's Table with Flowers*, (which I entirely disclaim), I should still scrupulously abstain from doing so, out of deference to the strong objections which your Lordship has publicly expressed upon the subject. It has been customary to *deck the Reredos*, and other parts of the Church with *Flowers* and *Evergreens* at the three great Festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, as is the practice in many neighbouring Churches. The choicer flowers used on these occasions, have either been sent to us, or their cost defrayed by special gifts. I am sorry that Mr. WESTERTON should have stated in his printed *Letter* that these "expensive floral displays," or as he, with unnecessary coarseness, entitled them in his *Protest* to me, "*meretricious trumpery*," have been hitherto defrayed out of the OFFERTORY. Such is not the case. The facts are as follows. In my predecessor's time it was customary to allow about £2. out of the respective *Offertories* of the above days to defray the cost of the ordinary decorations. In the same way, during my Incumbency, some portion of the expence has been borne by the Offertory; but by far the larger portion has come from private resources. (p. 10)\*.... Upon the subject of *decorations* generally, I beg to add a few words. '*Decoration*' according to JOHNSON, means '*embellishment, ornament, added beauty*'—and we *add this beauty* in the way of *Flowers* and *Evergreens* to the ordinary structures of our Churches at certain great Festivals, to give a joyous character to those seasons; to mark the Church's distinction of fast and festival. Now I wish to take a common sense view of this matter, because I am sure *that* is the way to influence the minds of English people generally. I can see a decided difference of principle, between the use of *natural*, and *artificial* Flowers on these occasions. One is the practice of the

---

\* MR. LIDDELL, in a Letter to the '*Guardian*,' dated May 8th, 1854, writes:—"It is stated "that an *Alms-Chest* has been provided "to receive contributions for the *Decorations* of the Church." This "is simply and entirely *untrue*. The three *Alms-Chests* are, as "they have always been, neither more nor less. Two are provided, "according to the CANON, for general purposes; a *third*, with a "double lid, was used for gathering Offerings towards ST BARNABAS' "*Building Fund*. Since that account was closed, the Alms placed "in this Box are, according to a notice immediately over it, "*Devoted "exclusively to the maintenance of the Choir.*" I did put up a *written "paper* at Christmas, and Easter, soliciting special Offerings for "the *Decorations*, but they were made, not through the *Alms- "Boxes*, but through the *Offertory*, each gift being wrapped up in "*paper*, with the special object written upon it. I presume that the "members of my Congregation may in this way give to what they "please, without asking the Churchwardens' leave."—See *Guardian*, May 10th, 1854.

‘English Church, the other that of the Church of Rome;’ and I wish loyally to adhere to the usage only of the Church of England. I go on to say, that if Church *decoration* be admitted at all amongst us, I can see no difference of principle, between the use of *Evergreens*, such as ‘*Laurestinus*’ with its Christmas bloom, and ‘*Holly*’ with its bright red berries, and that of *other* Flowers in their respective seasons. We wish to beautify the Church for a brief period in this way, and we take what is given us, or select what seems most suitable to our purpose. Again, if *Decorations* are used, it is surely worth while to take some pains that they may be in good taste. I can see no beauty in tying together clumsy masses of *green*, and placing them incongruously about the Church; but the same materials arranged with care, and applied in *wreaths*, subservient to the architecture of the Church, become real decorations; and the beautiful effect is materially improved by the judicious *admixture of Flowers*.’ (p. 12.)—*Letter to the Bp. of LONDON, Pub. by J. T. Hayes.*

The BISHOP of LONDON, in his decision on the ‘Presentment’ (March 28th, 1854), thus remarked with respect to these *Decorations*:—‘Your complaint respecting the use of *Flowers* upon the Communion-Table (which I condemned in my Charge of 1842) † appears to be groundless; Mr. Liddell assures me, that no Flowers are ever so placed. The Church, it seems, at the great Festivals, is decorated with *Flowers* and *Evergreens*, as very many other Churches are; only in St Paul’s, Knightsbridge, the floral decorations are made to harmonize with the architectural outlines of the Church, instead of being placed here and there in bunches; and this you designate as “meretricious trumpery!” This is rather a matter of taste than of order; but I think that taste should not be so far consulted, as to lead to the adoption of a style of ornament at variance with the sober and quiet character which marks the Services of our Church, and which ought to pervade its external adjuncts and appliances.’ (p. 44.)—*Correspondence between the Bp. of LONDON and the Churchwarden.* Pub. by C. Westerton.

MR. A. W. PUGIN remarks that:—‘FLOWERS have been constantly used in the Church as emblems of joy and festivity; and also as symbols of love and devotion towards the Saints and Martyrs: whose manifold graces and virtues are shadowed forth in their rich variety of hue and odour. FORTUNATUS, Bp. of Poitiers, who flourished in the 6th century, has commemorated the custom that prevailed at that period of hanging *Flowers* in crowns and garlands over the Altars.... They were also suspended round the walls of Churches... The custom of decorating Churches

---

\* GAVANTUS, describing the Romish usage in this respect, writes:—‘*Floribus* item, ex exquisitis quibusdam *ramulis*, aptè et concinnè dispositis, seu *veris*, seu *fictis*, pro temporum varietate, sive in vasculis elegantibus, sive alia ratione, ornari poterunt *Altaria*, exemplo NEPOTIANI, quem hac de re per honorificè sanctus HIERONYMUS commendat.’—*Thesaurus*. Vol. i. p. 73. Lugduni Ed. A. D. 1664.

† Quoted at page 623, *supra*.

'with *Flowers* and *Branches* is not only most ancient, but it is 'truly admirable, as proceeding from the beautiful principle of 'making all the creatures of God contribute in their season to 'increase the solemnities of His worship.... It should, however, 'he remarked, that each quarter of the year, in succession, produces 'a fresh variety for this purpose, nor less beautiful is the *red-berried Holly*, fresh and bristly among the tapers of a Christmas night, than the *Roses* of the Assumption. While nature then supplies 'the richest stores for each succeeding Festival, how monstrous 'is the *modern practice* (sic) of resorting to *paper leaves* and *tinsel flowers*, standing like faded trumpery throughout the year, a 'mockery and a disgrace to the sacred edifices where they are 'suffered to remain. The English Churches were decorated 'several times in the course of the year. There are mentioned in 'the old Parish accounts, *S. Mary Outwich*, London:—1524. Item, 'for hyrch at *Midsomer*, ijd. Item, for holy and ivy at *Chrystmas*, 'ijd. 1525. Paid for korks, flowers, and yew, ijd. Paid for hrome 'ageynst *Ester*, id. Paid for hyrche and bromys at *Midsomer*, iiii. 'Paid for rose garlands on *Corps. Axi. daye*, vi. d. The custom 'of decorating the English Parish Churches at *Christmas* and '*Whitsuntide* is still retained in many Towns and Villages.' (p. 127.).—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume.*

### FONT. [pp. 625—636.]—

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD observes:—'To place the *Font* in some 'obscure corner, where it never meets the eye,—or to perform the 'Baptismal Service from a *Basin*, placed, as has been sometimes 'seen, on the Communion-Table,—is, to say the least, most inde- 'corous; and seems to imply that the Holy Sacrament of Baptism 'is not understood or duly valued. The *Font* ought to present 'itself as we cross the threshold of the Sanctuary.... Viewed as 'the laver of regeneration, the propriety of placing it at the *west entrance*, directly facing the Communion-Table, is obvious.... 'There should be a clear space of some feet in extent, round the '*Font* for the accommodation of the Sponsors,—and covered has- 'socks, or boards with stuffed tops, provided for them to kneel on. 'These latter may be laid on the edge of the hase on which the '*Font* is erected, and by means of a wooden peg prevented from 'getting out of place. And when the *Font* is situated in the 'Tower, additional kneeling-boards may be placed along the wall 'on either side without incommoding persons on entering or leaving 'Church. Every *Font* should be supplied with a *plug* and *water-drain*; and a *stone-pitcher*, which might be kept in the Vestry, 'may be reserved for bringing in water when required.' (p. 27.).—*Parochialia.*

The *Tract*, "A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS," says:— 'The requisites for a *Font* are: (1) It must be *in the Nave*, and '(2) *near a Door*, to typify admission into the Church by Holy 'Baptism; (3) it must be of *stone*; (4) must have a *Cover*; (5) 'must be *large enough* for immersion; and (6) must be provided 'with a *plug*, and *drain*, and should be *lined with lead*.' (p. 19.).—*Pub. by the 'Cambridge Camden Society.*

MR. A. W. PUGIN, when describing on *Octagon*, says:—'An '*Octagon* is a figure of *eight* equal sides, and considered as an



‘emblem of regeneration, consequently the proper form for *Baptisteries* and *Fonts*.’ (p. 167.).—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume*.

### IMAGES, PAINTINGS, &c. [pp. 636—647.]—

The *Tract*, last quoted, remarks also, when speaking of *Stained Glass*:—‘The best glass may be obtained for from 20 to 30s. the square foot. But a beautiful kind, consisting of plain white quarries with a small yellow flower or pattern in each, may be obtained at about 10s. the square foot....Mosaick panes, with vine leaves and tendrils creeping over them, and coloured horders and medallions, are exquisitely beautiful, and may be had at about 15s. the square foot. But we must not think that stained glass, and encaustick tiles are sufficient. The walls and roofs, if this be all, will look unusually bare. The *Rood-Screens*, the *Font-cover*, even the Monuments, Piers, and Shafts, should be painted and gilded. So should the *Pulpit*; so may the roof or vaulting. We are not here about to enter into a philosophical discussion as to the propriety of painting stone. It is sufficient to state that it must often be so, if we would have a consistent Church. The subjects for distemper-painting on the walls may either be taken from the most approved Ecclesiastical emblems and devices; or foliage, architectural designs, instructive legends of Saints, or representations of sacramental subjects, may be adopted.’ (p. 28.).—*Pub. by the ‘Cambridge Camden Society’.*

### LECTERN [pp. 647—654.]—

ARCHDEACON SANDFORD, when describing a *Lectern*, observes:—‘The moveable Desk possesses the advantage that it can be turned so as to face the bulk of the Congregation....It also admits of the ‘*Lessons*’ being read by a person not yet in Holy Orders, which may occasionally be desirable, as in the case of graduates preparing for the Ministry. It may be placed just beneath the Pulpit.’ (p. 29.).—*Parochialia*.

The *Tract*, “A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS,” writes:—‘The *Lectern* may be either of brass or wood. It may be described as a Desk on the top of a stand, about 5 ft. in height. From it the “*Lessons*” are to be read....*Brazen Eagles* are, however, the most beautiful ornaments; they are sometimes represented as trampling on a serpent, and the stem is supported on three or four lions.’ (p. 25.).—*Pub. by the ‘Cambridge Cam. Soc.’*

MR. A. W. PUGIN writes:—‘LECTERN or LETTERN, a Choir Desk, from whence the *Lessons* and *Antiphons* were chanted. Also a stand, from whence the Gospel was sung. They were sometimes constructed of wood, but often of brass....The *Eagle* which is so constantly found in these Lecterns was originally introduced with reference to S. John, as these were first used for chanting the Gospel in the Mass. According to GEORGIUS, the representation of a Serpent or Dragon is generally found under the claws of the bird, probably in further allusion to the same Saint....*Lecterns* were sometimes made of iron or wood, to fold up, like a tray stand, one frame being made considerably larger

'than the other so that the leather connecting them might present 'an inclined surface when extended.... Wooden Lecterns of elegant 'design, and usually double desked, were frequently used in the old 'Parochial Churches.' (p. 152.)—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume.*

### LIGHTS, CANDLESTICKS, &c. [pp. 655—670.]—

At ST. PAUL'S, *Knightsbridge*, a 'Presentment' was made to the Ordinary, (Dec. 20th, 1853) by the Parish Churchwarden against various usages, and among them, the placing of *Candles on the Altar* (p. 9): and in a 'Remonstrance' to the Incumbent by the same Churchwarden (Feb. 4th, 1854), the following passage occurs on this question:—'I have, lastly, to complain, that whereas 'hy divers *Injunctions* of Edward VI, and otherwise, the setting 'up of *Candlesticks upon the Communion-Table*, is expressly 'forbidden. And that, moreover, the said practice is not anywhere 'ordained in any of the Canons or other Laws of the Reformed 'Church; that in total disregard of such Injunctions and other 'Law in that behalf, and notwithstanding the ordinary custom of 'the Reformed Church to the contrary, *Candlesticks* have been 'placed upon the said '*High Altar*,' and still remain standing 'thereon; and I do accordingly protest against the use of the 'same, either as ornament or furniture of the said Church of St 'Paul. And I do, moreover, declare and insist that such *Candlesticks* do not properly belong to the Service, or any part of the 'Service, of Divine Worship. And I do further insist, that the 'practice of setting up *Candlesticks* in such places, and especially 'in such manner and form, as aforesaid, is a practice not only 'unusual and unauthorized in the Protestant Reformed Church, 'but I regard it as, and I do humbly declare it to be, a superstitious 'and vain custom borrowed from the Roman Church, calculated 'to bring scandal upon Public Worship, and to pander to the 'worst and most superstitious appetites of a morbid imagination.' (p. 11.)—*Letter of Remonstrance to the REV. R. LIDDELL.*

The Rev. ROBERT LIDDELL, replying to this '*Remonstrance*' by a Letter to the Bp. OF LONDON (Feb. 27th, 1854), says:—'With 'reference to the *Candlesticks on the Altar*, MR. WESTERTON seems 'to me singularly infelicitous in his quotation of the Injunctions 'of Edward VI, as expressly forbidding them....(After quoting the *Injunctions*, which we have already given in page 655; MR. LIDDELL proceeds—)....'I need hardly add, that *Candles* are 'to be seen on the *Altars* of almost all our Cathedrals; that they 'are in the Temple Church, and in the Chapel Royal.' (p. 14).—*Letter to the BISHOP OF LONDON, Pub. by J. T. Hayes.*

The Bp. OF LONDON, in his decision on the 'Presentment', (March 28th, 1854), thus expressed himself with respect to the *Candlesticks*:—'As to the *Candlesticks on the Communion-Table*, I 'have stated my opinion, in my '*Charge*' of 1842', and I am not 'prepared to retract that opinion. *I had rather not see them* 'in *Parish Churches*; but I am not prepared to order their removal when they have been placed there for several years.' (p. 43.)—*Correspondence between the Bp. OF LONDON, and the Churchwarden. Pub. by C. Westerton.*

---

\* Quoted in page 663, *supra*.

MR. A. W. PUGIN, speaking of the various kinds of *Candlesticks* used in the Romish Church, thus describes the ALTAR-CANDLESTICKS:—‘There are 5 parts in an *Altar-Candlestick*: (1) the ‘Foot; (2) the Stem; (3) the Knop, which for the convenience ‘of lifting, is placed about the middle of the Stem; (4) the Bowl, to ‘receive the droppings of wax; and (5) the Pricket terminating ‘the Stem on which the Taper is fixed. Whatever enrichments ‘may be introduced about a *Candlestick*, they should always be ‘subservient to these essential forms. *Altar-Candlesticks* have ‘been made in gold, silver, or silver parcel gilt, copper gilt, latten, ‘brass, crystal, and wood. (DE MOLEON mentions that the Can- ‘dlesticks used in Lyons Cathedral during Lent were of wood.) ‘*Candlesticks* do not appear to have been placed on the Altar ‘previous to the 10th century, but to have been arranged round it. ‘Till the 16th century, and even later, the usual number was *two*, ‘one on either side of the Cross. As is evident from illuminations ‘and inventories, the custom of placing *only two Candles on the ‘Altar* was by no means peculiar to the English Church.... From ‘ancient representations, we gather, however, that some of these ‘*Candlesticks* were furnished with several prickets.... The ancient ‘*Candlesticks* were mostly low, with tapers of no great height. ‘The high Tapers placed on *Altar-Candlesticks* on the Continent ‘are of comparatively modern introduction. The present custom ‘of the Church is to place 6 *Candlesticks* on the High Altar, and ‘7, when a Bishop celebrates solemnly in his Cathedral. The ‘number of *Altar-Candlesticks* was not *always* confined to *two* ‘in the English Church. (Till the end of the last century several ‘*Altars* in the great French Churches were *without Candlesticks*, ‘and there was often a great variety in the number.’ (p. 43).... ‘ELEVATION CANDLESTICKS:—A pair of large *Candlesticks*, stand- ‘ing either within or without the Curtains, on the sides of the ‘Altar, holding Tapers, lit immediately before the consecration, and ‘in some Churches extinguished immediately after the Elevation, ‘in others left burning till after the Communion. This term is not ‘of any great antiquity. The *Candles* lit to honour the Blessed ‘Sacrament, during the Elevation, were generally held in the hands ‘of the Assistants.... STANDING CANDLESTICKS are standards to ‘hold a number of Tapers, set up in Choirs near Shrines and Im- ‘ages, many.... consisting of a succession of diminishing circlets, ‘supported by the standard, and forming a pyramidal mass of ‘light.... *Standing Candlesticks* of seven lights were often set up ‘in the great French Churches.... In English Churches they ‘were often of *ten* branches.’ (p. 46).... ‘A *CORONA* was a crown or ‘circlet suspended from the roof or vaulting of a Church, to hold ‘lighted tapers on solemn occasions. There was scarcely a Church ‘in ancient times which was not provided with a *Corona*, richer ‘or plainer in design, according to the wealth or dignity of the ‘foundation. Sometimes they were formed of triple circles, which, ‘when filled with tapers, produced a pyramidal form of light. The ‘number of tapers in these *Coronas* was regulated according to the ‘solemnity of the Festival, and at the solemnity of *Easter* the great ‘*Corona*, which usually hung in the centre before the great hood, ‘presented a most glorious and lively emblem of the Resurrection.’ (p. 78.)—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume*. (See Note. p. 773.).

## LITANY-STOOL. [pp. 670—676.]—

In the *Tract*, “A FEW WORDS TO CHURCH-BUILDERS,” it is stated :—‘The *Litany-Stool*, whence the ‘*Litany*’ ought to be offered, and the other Prayers may be read, is a small *Desk* at which to kneel; it is to be turned to the East. The front admits of the most elaborate panelling. Its proper place in a Parish Church is at the entrance to the Chancel, or the west side of the Rood-Screen. Its use is sanctioned indirectly by all parts of the RUBRIC, and it occurs under the name of *Fald-Stool* in the “Coronation Service.” It is used in several of our Cathedrals.’ (p. 25.).—*Pub. by the ‘Cambridge Camden Society.’*

## SEDILIA, ALTAR-CHAIRS. [pp. 740—746.]—

MR. A. W. PUGIN says :—‘CHAIRS of stone, wood, or metal, but more frequently the latter, were used in the Choirs of ancient Churches. The very name of Cathedral being derived from *Cathedra*, the Bishop’s seat. The *Chair* or *Throne* of the Bishop was anciently placed at the extreme east or absis of the Choir, behind the Altar.... This was undoubtedly the case in England prior to the 13th century, after which the *Throne* was placed at the east extremity of the Stalls on the Epistle side of the Choir.... In the foreign Churches where the absidal form of the eastern end was always retained, the Bishop’s Throne kept its original position much longer.... These *Chairs* were often of stone.... In many of the Episcopal functions the Bishop used a *Faldding-Chair*, called a FALDISTORIUM (*Faldstool*), on account of the facility with which it could be transported from one place to another. The *Officiating Clergy* were formerly seated in SEDILIA, or niches in the wall, on the Epistle side of the Choir or Chancel; in most of the English Parish Churches these *Sedilia* remain, although disused.... These *Sedilia*, or Stalls, for the Celebrant and Assistants, were formerly to be found in every foreign Church; but the love of modern Italian design, to which the Catholic Clergy of the last three centuries have been so lamentably addicted, combined with the stiffness of modern *Vestments*, which rendered these seats inconvenient, has banished them from all the ancient Continental Choirs, and in lieu of them *Chairs* of the most unsuitable description, fit only for the saloon of an hotel, are frequently used. The CANTORS who regulated the chant of the Choir were provided with *Chairs* with low backs of a rounded form, to enable them to fling their *Copes* over when sitting. .... The *Chairs* now used by the Anglican Clergy, and placed against the east wall of the Chancel, are of recent introduction, offensive by their position, and generally hideous in design’.... (Examples of ancient Chairs are here referred to, and described as being) ‘exceedingly low in the back, like most of the early *Chairs*, and supported by four legs of brass with the heads and feet of lions. The representation of lions as supports for *Chairs* and *Thrones* are commonly found in the ancient examples.... In “*Le Genealogie des Comtes de Flandre*,” by OLIVIER DE WREE, are several seals figured with Bishops seated on low *Chairs*, like a *Falddistorium* without arms or back, and covered with a piece of rich stuff hanging down, in some cases on the front and back, and in others from the sides of the cushion.’ (p. 53.).—*Glossary of Eccl. Ornament and Costume.*

51, TRUMPINGTON-STREET, CAMBRIDGE,

*February, 1860.*

A LIST

OF

New Works and New Editions,

PUBLISHED BY

J. HALL & SON.



# J. HALL & SON'S

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

These Books may be obtained through any Bookseller, but the Publishers will be happy, on receiving a post-office order for the amount, to send them to any part of the United Kingdom.

---

**An Easy, Practical Hebrew Grammar;** with Exercises for translation from Hebrew into English, and from English into Hebrew: To which is attached, *The FOUNTAINS OF SALVATION*; being a Translation, with Notes Critical and Explanatory, of Isaiah LIII. Also, a *KEY* to the *EXERCISES*, by the Rev. P. H. MASON, M.A. Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge; and the late Dr. HERMANN HEDWIG BERNARD, Hebrew Teacher in the University, Cambridge. Price of the complete Work, in 2 vols 8vo bds 28s.

The *ELEMENTARY PART* may be had separately. 8vo bds 5s.

**Compendium Theologicum; or Manual for Students in Theology,** Containing a Concise History of the Primitive and Mediæval Church,—the Reformation,—the Church of England,—the English Liturgy and Bible,—and the XXXIX Articles, with Scripture Proofs and Explanations. Intended for those preparing for *Theological Examinations*, with Examination Papers. By the Rev. O. ADOLPHUS, M.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. *Second Edition*, much improved. royal 18mo bds 5s.

*The above is recommended for the Voluntary Theological and Ordination Examinations.*

BY THE REV. W. H. PINNOCK, LL.D. CANTAB.

**New Testament History;** an Analysis of (*Dedicated by permission to the Regius Professor of Divinity*) Embracing the Criticism and Interpretation of the original Text; with *Questions for Examination*. *Seventh Edition*, 18mo bds 4s.

**Scripture History;** an Analysis of, (*Dedicated, by permission, to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff*). Intended for Readers of *OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY*; with *Examination Questions*. *Ninth Edition*, 18mo bds 3s. 6d.

**Ecclesiastical History;** an Analysis of, (*Dedicated, by permission, to the late Norrissian Professor of Divinity*). From the Birth of Christ, to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. With *Examination Questions*. *Fifth Edition*, 18mo bds 3s. 6d.

**The History of the Reformation;** an Analysis of, (*Dedicated, by permission, to the Lord Bishop of Ety*); with the prior and Subsequent History of the English Church; with *Examination Questions*. *Fourth Edition*, 18mo bds 4s. 6d.

**A Short Analysis of Old Testament History, or Scripture Facts;** with Questions for Schools. *Second Edition*, 18mo bds 1s. 6d.

*This has been published at the request of several Heads of Schools, for the Junior Classes.*

By REV. W. TROLLOPE, M.A.

**The Acts of the Apostles**, a Commentary on, *with Examination Questions*, chiefly selected from Examination Papers, especially intended for Candidates preparing for the B. A. Degree. *Fourth Edition*, with considerable improvements. crown 8vo bds 4s.

**The Gospel of St Matthew**, Questions and Answers on. *Second Edition*, 12mo bds 4s.

**The Gospel of St Luke**, a Commentary on; *with Examination Questions*, accompanied by References to the Text at the foot of each page. *Second Edition*, 12mo bds 4s.

**XXXIX Articles of the Church of England**, Questions and Answers on the. *Fourth Edition*, 18mo bds 2s. 6d.

**Liturgy of the Church of England**, Questions and Answers on the. *Fifth Edition*, 18mo bds 2s.

**Justini Philosophi et Martyris Apologia Prima**, edited with a correct Text, English Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 8vo bds 6s.

---

By REV. W. GORLE, M.A.

*Rector of Whatcote, Warwickshire.*

**Butler's Analogy, a New Analysis of**, with *Questions*. 18mo bds 3s.

**Pearson on the Creed**, an Analysis of, with *Examination Questions*. *Second Edition*, 18mo bds 4s.

**Hooker, Book V., an Analysis of**, with *Examination Questions*. 18mo bds 4s.

---

**The Epistle to the Romans**, Annotations on: Critical, Philological, and Explanatory. 12mo bds 4s.

**The Gospel of St John**, Annotations on; Critical, Philological, and Explanatory. By L. S. D. REES, M.A. 12mo bds 3s. 6d.

**Grotius (Hugo) on the Truth of the Christian Religion**, translated by Dr. JOHN CLARKE, with Notes; a *New Edition*, crown 8vo bds 3s. 6d.

**Paley's Evidences of Christianity**, comprising the Text of Paley, verbatim; *Examination Questions* at the foot of each page, and a full Analysis prefixed to each Chapter, by the Rev. GEORGE FISK, LL.B. Prebendary of Lichfield. *Third Edition*, crown 8vo bds 4s. 6d.

**Ordination Questions**, as given at the recent Examinations for *Deacons*, and *Priests*; *with Instructions to Candidates*. 18mo bds 1s.

**Persæ of Æschylus**, a *Literal Translation* of the. 12mo sewed, 1s.



**Mathematical Questions** of the *Senate-House Examination Papers for Honors*, 1838 to 1849, arranged in order according to subjects, by the Rev. A. H. FROST, M.A., St John's College, Cambridge, 8vo bds 4s. 6d.

**The Problems and Riders** set in the *First Three Days* of the *January Examination* for Cambridge B.A. Degree, 1853, with *their Solutions*, by E. WALKER, M.A., late Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, 8vo sewed, 2s. 6d.

**Senate-House Questions in Arithmetic**, from 1830 to 1851, which have been proposed to Candidates for the Ordinary B.A. Degree, with SOLUTIONS, by R. HARPER, M.A., Corpus Christi College, and Rector of the Royal Academy, Inverness, 8vo bds 2s. 6d. \*

**Euripides—Orestes, Phœnissæ, Hecuba, and Andromache**, *Literally Translated*. 12mo sewed, 1s. 6d. each.

**Poppo's Prolegomena to Thucydides**, Translated and Abridged by G. BURGESS, M.A. 8vo bds 5s.

**Calculus of Finite Differences**, with the Application of its Principles to the Summation and Interpolation of, by H. KUHF, M.A. 8vo sewed, 2s. 6d.

**Euclid**, Enunciations and Corollaries of the Propositions of SIX FIRST BOOKS, with the ELEVENTH, 18mo sewed, 6d.

With Figures, 1s.

**Senate-House Examination Papers, (Little-Go)** in *Old Testament History, Paley's Evidences, Greek Testament, and Arithmetic*, given in the Lent Terms, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1851, 1852. 12mo sewed, 6d. each.

**Examination Papers**, Senate-House, in the *Acts of the Apostles, Arithmetic and Algebra, Euclid, Mechanics and Hydrostatics, and Paley's Philosophy*; which have been given to the Candidates for B.A. Degree, 1841 to 1848, and 1850. 12mo sewed, 1s. each.

**Examination Papers**, Voluntary Theological, as given in October, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857. 12mo sewed, 6d. each.

**Virgilii Æneidos, Lib. XII.**, with English Notes, and a *Literal Translation*, from the Text of Heyne, Forbiger, Wagner, and others. By J. DENMAN, B.C.L., of St John's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo bds 4s. interleaved.

**Sophocles, the Tragedies of**, a *Literal Translation* of, from the Text of Wunder, with Copious Notes, by C. D. YONGE, B.A. *Second Edition*, 12mo bds 5s.

*Any of the Plays may be had separately at 1s. each*

**Sophocles Ajax**; from the Text of Wunder, with copious *English Explanatory Notes*, &c.; by D. B. HICKIE, LL.D., *Head Master of Hawkshead Grammar School*. 12mo bds 2s. 6d.

*Also a Translation of the above, 12mo sewed, 1s.*

**Herodotus, Book III.**, from the Text of Baehr, with English Notes, and a *Literal Translation*, by P. J. F. GANTILLON, B.A. 12mo *interleaved*, Price, 4s.

**Homer's Iliad, Book III. & IV.**, with *English Notes*, and a *Literal Translation*. 12mo *interleaved*, 4s. 6d.

**Cicero Pro Milone**; *Translated into Literal English*. By a Graduate. 12mo *sewed*, 2s.

**Cicero Oratio Pro L. Murenæ**, with a *Literal Translation and English Notes*, by H. REYNOLDS, M.A. 12mo *sewed*, 2s.

**Demosthenes Contra Midiam**, a *Literal Translation* of, by G. BURGESS, M.A. *Second Edition*, 12mo *sewed*, 2s.

**Demosthenes' Three Olynthiac Orations**, a *Literal Translation* of, 12mo *sewed*, 1s. 6d.

**Demosthenes**, a *Literal Translation* of the FIRST PHILIPPIC and Oration "DE PACE," with Notes. 12mo *sewed*, 1s. 6d.

**Cambridge College Examination Papers**, in ARITHMETIC and ALGEBRA, as given at all the Colleges, for the last five years. 8vo bds 6s.

IN PLANE TRIGONOMETRY. 8vo bds 4s.

**The Elements of Mechanics and Hydrostatics**, with numerous *Examples*, designed chiefly for those who are Candidates for the Ordinary B.A. Degree. By the Rev. S. F. WILLIAMS, M.A., St John's College. 12mo bds 5s.

**A First Course of Mathematics**, comprising Arithmetic, Algebra, Statics, and Hydrostatics, as required for the Ordinary B.A. Degree, with *Examples, and a Key*; by the Rev. J. HATTERSLEY, M.A., St John's College, Cambridge. 8vo bds 7s.



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01187 4221







